

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
OR
CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR
JULY, 1883 OCTOBER, 1883.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CLVIII.

LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER, LONDON.
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.

1883.

LONDON : PRINTED BY
HOLLIS WOODS AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

CONTENTS OF No. 324.

	Page
ART. I.—1. Nicolaus Copernicus. Von Leopold Prowe. Erster Band : Das Leben. Berlin : 1883.	
2. Nicolai Copernici Torunensis De Revolutionibus Orbium Cælestium Libri sex. Warsaw : 1854.	
3. Nicolaus Copernicus aus Thorn über die Kreisbewegungen der Weltkörper. Uebersetzt und mit Anmerkungen von Dr. C. L. Menzzer. Thorn : 1879	295
II.—1. Dissertations on Early Law and Custom. By Sir Henry Sumner Maine, K.C.S.I., LL.D., F.R.S. London : 1883.	
2. Asiatic Studies—Religious and Social. By Sir Alfred Lyall, K.C.B., C.I.E. London : 1882.	
3. The English Village Community examined in its Relations to the Manorial and Tribal Systems, and to the Common or Open-Field System of Husbandry. By Frederic Seebohm. London : 1883,	333
III.—Records of the English Catholics under the Penal Laws, chiefly from the Archives of the See of Westminster.	
1. The First and Second Diaries of the English College, Douay, and an Appendix of unpublished Documents. Edited by Fathers of the Congregation of the London Oratory. With an Historical Introduction by T. F. Knox, D.D. London : 1878.	
2. The Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen (1532–1594). With an Historical Introduction by T. F. Knox, D.D. London : 1882,	354
IV.—1. Eastern Persia. An Account of the Journeys of the Persian Boundary Commission, 1870–71–72. Vol. I. The Geography ; with Narratives by Majors St. John, Lovett, and Evan Smith, and an Introduction by Major-General Sir Frederic John Goldsmid, C.B., K.C.S.I. Published by the authority of the Government of India. London : 1876.	
2. Despatches from Her Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg, forwarding translations of the published reports of M. Lassar's journeys in Central Asia. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty, 1883.	
3. The Russians at Merv and Herat, and their power of invading India. By Charles Marvin. 8vo. London : 1883,	389

- V.—1. An Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language, to which is prefixed a Dissertation on the Origin of the Scottish Language. By John Jamieson, D.D. A new Edition, carefully revised and collated, with the entire Supplement incorporated, by John Longmuir, A.M., LL.D., and David Donaldson, F.E.I.S. 4 vols. Paisley : 1879–1882.
2. A Critical Inquiry into the Scottish Language, with the View of illustrating the Rise and Progress of Civilisation in Scotland. By Francisque-Michel. Edinburgh and London : 1882.
3. The Poetry and Humour of the Scottish Language. By Charles Mackay, LL.D. Paisley : 1882, . 420
- VI.—The Herefordshire Pomona. Containing Coloured Figures and Descriptions of the most esteemed kinds of Apples and Pears. Edited by Robert Hogg, LL.D., F.L.S.; &c., for the Woolhope Club. Parts I. to V. folio. London and Hereford : 1878–1882, . 447
- VII.—1. Schubert. By Sir George Grove, D.C.L., Director of the Royal College of Music. 'Dictionary of Music and Musicians,' vol. iii. London : 1882.
2. Life of Chopin. By Franz Liszt. Translated from the French by M. Walker Cook. London : 1877.
3. F. Chopin; his Life, Letters, and Works. By Moritz Karasowski. Translated from the German by Emily Hill. London : 1879.
4. Franz Liszt. By L. Rainann. Translated from the German by Miss E. Cowdery. London : 1882 . 475
- VIII.—1. Histoire de la Guerre Civile en Amérique. Par M. le Comte de Paris, ancien Aide de Camp du Général MacClellan. Tomes V. et VI. 8vo. Paris : 1883.
2. Campaigns of the Civil War. Vol. VI. Chancellorsville and Gettysburg. By Abner Doubleday, Brevet-Major-General, U.S.A., commanding the First Corps at Gettysburg. Vol. VIII. The Mississippi. By Francis Vinton 'Greene, Lieut. of Engineers, U.S.A., late Military Attaché to the U.S. Legation at St. Petersburg. 12 vols. 12mo. New York : 1882.
3. The Navy in the Civil War. Vol. III. The Gulf and Inland Waters. By Commander A. T. Mahan, U.S.N. 3 vols. 12mo. New York : 1883, . 510
- IX.—Correspondence of the Earl of Aberdeen. 1850–1853. Privately printed, not published. 8vo. 1880 . 547

CONTENTS OF No. 323.

	Page
ART. I.—Don John of Austria; or, Passages from the History of the Sixteenth Century, 1547–1578. Illustrated with plates and numerous wood engravings. By the late Sir William Stirling Maxwell, Baronet, K.T. Two volumes folio. London: 1883, . . .	1
II.—1. A New History of the English Stage. By Percy Fitzgerald, M.A., F.S.A. Two volumes. London: 1882.	
2. Histoire Universelle du Théâtre. Par Alphonse Royer. Quatre tomes. Paris: 1869.	
3. Our Old Actors. By Henry Barton Baker. Two volumes. London: 1878.	
4. Mémoires de Samson de la Comédie Française. Paris: 1882.	
5. Reports published by the Council of the Church and Stage Guild, London, 1880, 1881, and Papers read before the Guild by Rev. Stewart D. Headlam, Mrs. Stewart Headlam, Miss Ella Dietz, and others.	
6. Hroswithæ Gandeshemensis Comœdiæ Sex. Edidit I. Bendixen. Lubeca: 1862,	57
III.—Atti della Giunta per la Inchiesta Agraria e sulle Condizioni della Classe Agricola. Rome: 1881–2, . . .	90
IV.—Histoire du droit et des institutions politiques, civiles et judiciaires de l'Angleterre, comparés au droit et aux institutions de la France depuis leur origine jusqu'à nos jours. Par Ernest Glasson. Vols. 1–5. Paris: 1882, 1883,	118
V.—1. Bibliotheca Piscatoria, a Catalogue of Books on Angling, the Fisheries, and Fish-culture. By T. Westwood and T. Satchell. London: 1883.	
2. Bibliotheca Ichthyologica et Piscatoria. By D. M. Bosgoed. Haarlem: 1874.	
3. Angling Literature. By Osmund Lambert. London: 1881.	
4. A History of British Fresh-water Fishes. By the Rev. W. Houghton, M.A., F.L.S. Illustrated with a Coloured Drawing of each Species, and numerous Engravings. 2 vols. 4to. London: 1883,	152

	Page
VI.—Histoire de Charles VII. Par G. du Fresne, Marquis de Beaucourt. Deux tomes. Paris : 1881–2, .	170
VII.—1. An Account of Indian Serpents, collected on the Coast of Coromandel. Containing Descriptions and Drawings of each Species, together with Experiments and Remarks on their several Poisons. By Patrick Russell, M.D., F.R.S. In two vols. folio. London : 1796.	
2. North American Herpetology ; or, a Description of the Reptiles inhabiting the United States. By J. E. Holbrook, M.D. Philadelphia : 1842.	
3. The Reptiles of British India. By Albert C. L. G. Günther, M.D., Ray Society. London : 1864.	
4. The Snakes of Australia. An illustrated and descriptive Catalogue of all the known Species. By Gerard Krefft, F.L.S., C.M.L.S. Sydney : 1869.	
5. Indian Snakes. An Elementary Treatise on Ophiology in India, &c. By Edward Nicholson. Madras : 1870.	
6. The Thanotophidia of India, being a Description of the Venomous Snakes of the Indian Peninsula, with an Account of the Influence of their Poison on Life, and a Series of Experiments. By J. Fayrer, M.D., C.S.I., F.R.S.E. London : 1882.	
7. Snakes. Curiosities and Wonders of Serpent Life. By Catherine C. Hopley. London : 1882, .	199
VIII.—1. A Genealogical and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage of the British Empire. By Sir Bernard Burke, C.B., LL.D., Ulster King of Arms. 45th Edition. London : 1883.	
2. The Peerage, Baronetage, and Knightage of the British Empire. By Joseph Foster. Fourth Edition. Two vols. Westminster : 1883, .	225
IX.—1. L'Ouverture du Fleuve Rouge au Commerce. Par J. Dupuis. Paris : 1870.	
2. Voyage au Yunnan. Par J. Dupuis. Paris : 1880.	
3. La Province Chinoise du Yunnan. Par Emile Rocher. Paris : 1880.	
4. Histoire de l'Intervention Française au Tong-king de 1872–1874. Par F. Romanet du Caillaud. Paris : 1880.	
5. Across Chrysê. By Archibald R. Colquhoun. London : 1883.	
6. The Golden Chersonese. By Isabella Bird. London : 1883,	258

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
JULY, 1883.

No. CCCXXIII.

ART. I.—*Don John of Austria; or, Passages from the History of the Sixteenth Century, 1547–1578.* Illustrated with plates and numerous wood engravings. By the late Sir WILLIAM STIRLING MAXWELL, Baronet, K.T. Two volumes folio. London: 1883.

THE publication of these volumes is a fitting tribute to the memory of a highly accomplished Scottish gentleman, and, in our opinion, it places the late Sir William Stirling Maxwell in the first rank of the historians and writers of this country. Such as it is, this memorial is the result of his own industry and genius. He brought to it the unremitting perseverance of five-and-twenty years. In accuracy and abundance of research, in purity of style, in brilliancy of descriptive power, and in a just, though somewhat sarcastic, estimate of human character and actions, it seems to us to be inferior to no work which has issued from the press for many years: and we are convinced that it will confer upon its author no mean amount of posthumous fame. Our admiration of so finished a performance is only dashed by our deep regret that he who had already given the final touches to these pages did not survive to witness their reception by the world.

The history of the book itself partakes in some degree of the mystery and romance that attach to the illustrious subject of this biography. William Stirling of Keir, the son of Archibald Stirling and Elisabeth, daughter of Sir John Maxwell, was born in 1818. He graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1839; sat in Parliament as member for Perthshire from 1852 to 1868; and succeeded to the baronetcy of Maxwell of Pollock in 1866.* The house of Keir, hard

* Sir William Stirling Maxwell, K.T., was Lord Rector of Edinburgh University 1872–4; Chancellor of Glasgow University 1874–8;

by the old cathedral of Dunblane and the banks of Allan Water, commands from a gentle eminence that fertile vale through which the streams of the Forth and the Teith roll on their course towards the ancient walls of Stirling. It would be hard to name in broad Scotland a spot more dear to our history, our poetry, and our national life. Here, then, the young Laird of Keir, the inheritor of an ample fortune, accumulated the treasures of literature and art which he esteemed above all his other possessions. In the cedarn chambers and galleries of his library, ornamented with innumerable mottoes and devices, in which he took a fanciful delight, Keir had collected a vast and curious assemblage of books, embracing a variety of subjects, but in one branch unrivalled—in the literature and annals of Spain. From an early age Mr. Stirling had been struck, like his friend Richard Ford, by that passionate attraction to Spain which we have witnessed more than once in minds of no common order. He had visited the country, he had mastered the language. The romance, the heroism, the daring of the Spanish character; the stern dignity tempered by a biting wit; the subtle combinations of policy, and even the ruthless execution of those schemes by men who were for a moment all but the masters of the world, exercised an irresistible fascination over him. He devoted his literary life, and it was a life of no common labour, to a complete mastery of the Spanish reigns of the sixteenth century. His first publication, indeed, was the ‘*Annals of the Artists of Spain*,’ published in 1848. This was followed, in 1852, by the ‘*Cloister Life of Charles V.*,’ which threw a new light and a fresh interest on the closing scenes of Yuste. In 1870, the magnificent volume entitled the ‘*Chief Victories of Charles V.*,’ with the designs of Martin Heemskerck, and a multitude of choice and curious illustrations, was presented to the members of the Philobiblon Society, and reviewed at the time in this Journal. Two years later, the still rarer and more costly volume of the ‘*Portraiture of the Sixteenth Century*’ was presented to some of Sir W. Stirling Maxwell’s friends and to some public libraries; but of this work only fifty copies were printed. ‘*The Procession of Pope Clement VII.* and the

he was a trustee of the British Museum. Though defeated at the election for the County of Perth in 1868, for which he had previously sat for sixteen years, he was re-elected in 1874, and retained the seat till his death. We are indebted for these dates to Mr. Joseph Foster’s useful record of the Members of Parliament for Scotland, published in 1882.

‘Emperor Charles V.,’ from the designs of Hogenborg, with an historical introduction by Sir William Stirling Maxwell, appeared in 1875, and another magnificent folio, entitled ‘Antwerp Delivered in 1577,’ was passing through the press at the time of the author’s death. The author of these books was indifferent to literary fame, and indeed to any sort of notoriety. When in 1868 the electors of Perthshire thought fit to dismiss from their service a representative who stood foremost amongst the commoners of Scotland, his equanimity was unruffled; when the Crown in 1878 conferred upon him the ancient order of Scottish knighthood, even that rare distinction added nothing to the social position he owed to his talents and his birth.* He was alike indifferent to popularity and to what are called honours. He seldom allowed his books to be reprinted, and rather enjoyed the demand for these rare volumes. There was in Stirling a mixture of splendour and simplicity, of gravity and of humour, of *bonhomie* and satire, which rendered his conversation and his society infinitely attractive and agreeable to those who had the happiness to enjoy his friendship. Though somewhat eccentric, he was entirely unselfish. He loved to devote his vast fortune to noble purposes, especially in pursuit of literary objects. These he would spare no labour and no expense to promote. His exquisite taste and refinement left him dissatisfied with anything that fell short of supreme excellence; and as he applied this standard of criticism to his own works, he was apt to rate them below their real value. If at times a shade of melancholy pierced through his habitual gaiety, it was the melancholy of a man who lives in the pursuit of an unattainable perfection.

The ‘Life of Don John of Austria,’ the work now before us, is a striking example of this peculiarity. It was begun at least twenty-five years ago. It was even announced for publication by Messrs. Parker in 1870. To Sir William Stirling Maxwell, Don John of Austria was the most brilliant representative of the chivalry of Spain—the most gifted offspring of the great emperor who died at Yuste—and the short but splendid career of that young hero, ranging over a single decade of years, seemed to be a drama combining every

* The most ancient and most noble Scottish Order of the Thistle has never been conferred by the sovereign on any commoners, at least since the union of the Crowns, except on Sir William Stirling Maxwell. The honour done to him was therefore not only great, but unprecedented, and no Scotchman deserved it better.

element of historical and dramatic interest. To this life, therefore, he devoted all his powers. Europe was ransacked for books, manuscripts, and portraits to illustrate the period and the man. The work of composition proceeded with extreme slowness. Every incident was verified, every turn of expression was weighed. In this age of rapid and slovenly composition, we venture to say that no book has been written with so much care. Twice the whole manuscript was reprinted solely for the eye of the author. A vast quantity of blocks, woodcuts, engravings, portraits, and alphabets were collected for the ultimate publication. The whole work appears to have reached the final stage of preparation, even to the last corrections of the second proof-sheets in pencil, when the enthusiastic, ingenious, and eloquent historian was lost to us for ever. Sir William Stirling Maxwell caught a fever at Naples or at Florence, which he had just visited, and expired at Venice, on his way back to England, on January 15, 1878. Some years elapsed before the state of these manuscripts could be examined. When this was done, it was found that they wanted nothing to fit them for publication. The executors and representatives of Sir William Stirling Maxwell therefore thought it desirable that the aim of his literary life should be accomplished, and that the work should be given to the world as nearly as possible in the form which the author contemplated. The duty of passing the sheets through the press and superintending the arrangement of the work has been performed by Sir George W. Cox with excellent taste and judgment, his sole object being to ascertain as far as possible the intention of the author and adhere to it. A limited edition has been struck off in two volumes folio, with all the elaborate illustrations that had been prepared for it. These will form a rare ornament to the finest libraries. No book has issued from the British press for many years which surpasses or equals it in magnificent execution. The typography does the greatest credit to our townsmen, Messrs. Clark, of Edinburgh, and the publishers have spared no cost or labour to make it worthy of the writer to whose fame it is dedicated. A popular edition in a more convenient form will shortly place the book within reach of the public, and it needs no recommendation from us to direct their attention to so captivating a narrative; but we shall endeavour to give a sketch of it in the following pages, leaving, as far as possible, the author to relate the adventures of his favourite hero.

Such was the mystery thrown over the birth and the early years of the son of Charles V., who is known in history as

Don John of Austria, that some uncertainty and error hung about the two first conditions of all biography, his age and his name. It is now established by the evidence of the medal struck in honour of the conqueror of Lepanto in 1571, that he attained the age of twenty-four in that year. This date has been confirmed by an entry in the records of the Cortes of Toledo, which shows that in 1560 Don John had not then completed his fourteenth year. He was consequently born in 1547 and not in 1545, as had been affirmed by most of the historians, with the exception of Moreri and Mr. Prescott. The correction is important, for it subtracts two years from his short and brilliant life, and it gives a more surprising character to several of the earlier incidents in it. Don John was therefore exactly twenty years younger than his brother Philip II., and about two years older than the king's son, Don Carlos, who was born in 1545. It may here be remarked that, although no two beings ever lived who were less moved by human affections than these unamiable princes, and the father and son hated each other to the death, they both lived in almost unbroken friendship with Don John. The king treated his brother, who might have been an object of jealousy, like a favourite son; the prince, to whom his uncle might have been an object of rivalry, and who loved nothing else in the world, regarded him as a brother. Don John was everything that Don Carlos should have been and was not. Perhaps the most painful incident in his life was when Carlos confided to him as his friend, the diabolical designs he entertained against his own father, which Don John felt bound, in honour and in duty to his sovereign and his brother, to make known to the king.

On February 24, 1547, then, a day auspicious in the annals of Charles V., a natural son of that monarch was born to him in Ratisbon of a mother known as Barbara Blomberg, who had been introduced to sing to the emperor. Such, at least, is the most credible version of the story.* The lady, if such she was, was afterwards married to a commissary at Brussels and treated with liberality by Philip II.; but such was the violence of her temper that she braved and bullied the Duke of Alba himself. She lived to see her son Governor of the Low Countries, and survived him.

Strangely enough, the name by which this child of fortune was first known was not John, but Jerome. About two years

* Mr. Motley states, in his 'Dutch Republic' (vol. iii. p. 129), that Don John was born in 1545, and that his mother was 'a washer-woman of Ratisbon.' Both these statements are incorrect.

after his birth he was confided by the emperor to Don Luis Quixada, a Spanish nobleman, who enjoyed the full confidence of his master, and who kept the secret of his birth with unbroken fidelity; but by the express orders of Charles V. the boy was placed under the personal care of one Massi, a viol-player to his Majesty, under another name, and his education was carried on by the parish priest of Leganes, a small village where Massi and his wife lived, within a few miles of Madrid. As the musician kissed the emperor's hand in taking leave to return to Spain, Charles said to him: 'I hear that Quixada has given you a commission. Remember that I shall consider the fulfilment of his wishes as good service done to myself.' The village priest, little witting of his charge, handed over the boy to the sacristan, by whom he was sent to the common school of Getafe. The future hero of Lepanto trudged through the fields with his peasant schoolfellows, shooting sparrows on the way with a little crossbow.

In 1554 Charles Prevost, one of the grooms of the emperor's chamber, was sent to Leganes in a coach of state to remove the boy to Valladolid, where higher destinies awaited him. The village was amazed at the astounding event, and as the coach rolled away it was surrounded and pursued by urchins vociferating farewells to their departing comrade. At Valladolid Don John was presented to his sister, the Infanta Juana, Princess Dowager of Brazil, the mother of Don Sebastian of Portugal, then acting as Regent of Spain; but the secret of his birth was not made known either to the princess or to himself. Thenceforth he resided at Villagarcia in the family mansion of Quixada, and under the eye of his admirable wife. To this lady, Doña Magdalena de Ulloa, Don John owed not only his education but whatever was most amiable in his life and character. Childless herself, she willingly adopted him as her son, not without a jealous suspicion that he belonged by a closer tie to her own husband. An accident convinced her that the boy had a still higher parentage. The house took fire, and Quixada carried Don John to a place of safety before he attended to the preservation of his wife. She concluded that his honour was engaged in the discharge of a trust.

Charles V. reached the monastery of Yuste, after his abdication, on February 3, 1557. In March 1558 Quixada, still attached to the person of his sovereign, procured a house at Quacos, a village about a mile from Yuste, at the foot of its chestnut-covered hill. Hither Doña Magdalena and Don John repaired. The boy, then eleven years of age, seems to

have had free access to his unknown father. He went in and out of the emperor's chamber when he pleased. This circumstance is the more remarkable, as Charles expressly refused to allow Don Carlos, his grandson and heir, to approach his retreat, on the ground that the lad would be troublesome. It is pleasant to know that the last months of that great existence, saddened by care and by disease, were cheered by the presence and the promise of this gay, beautiful, and high-spirited child. Charles was delighted with him, and on the day before he died sent the capital of an annuity of 200 florins to his mother by a confidential hand. Possibly Don John may have been present at the solemn scene when the expiring emperor delivered into the hands of the priest the waxen taper which he held, as a symbol of the surrender of his soul to the mercy of his Creator. But Quixada was not there. At the funeral rites which followed, both were undoubtedly present.

Still the secret had been kept. The truth was unknown to the Princess Regent, and even to the king, until late in 1558, though public rumour already pointed to it. But, to remove all doubt from the subject, Charles V. had, even before his abdication—in 1554—added the following remarkable codicil to his will:—

‘Besides what is contained in my will, I say and declare that, when I was in Germany, and being a widower, I had, by an unmarried woman, a natural son, who is called Jerome, and that my intention has been and is, for certain reasons moving me thereto, that if it can be fairly accomplished, he should, of his free and spontaneous will, take the habit of some order of reformed friars, and that he should be put in the way of so doing, but without any pressure or force being employed towards him. But if it cannot be so arranged, and if he prefers leading a secular life, it is my pleasure and command that he should receive, in the ordinary manner each year, from twenty to thirty thousand ducats from the revenues of the kingdom of Naples; lands and vassals, with that rent attached, being assigned to him. The whole matter, both as to the assignment of the lands and the amount of the rent, is left to the discretion of my son, to whom I remit it; or, failing him, to the discretion of my grandson, the Infant Don Carlos, or of the person who, in conformity with my will, shall at the time it is opened be my heir. If at that time the said Jerome shall not have already embraced the state which I desire for him, he shall enjoy all the days of his life the said rent and lands, which shall pass to his the legitimate heirs and successors descending from his body. And whatever state the said Geronimo shall embrace, I charge the said prince my son, and my said grandson, and my heir, whosoever it may be, as I have said, at the opening of my will, to do him honour and cause him to be honoured, and that they show him fitting respect, and that they observe, fulfil, and execute in his favour that which is contained in this paper.

The which I sign with my name and hand : and it is sealed and sealed up with my small private seal ; and it is to be observed and executed like a clause of my said will. Done in Bruxelles, on the sixth day of the month of June 1554.

‘ Son, grandson, or whoever at the time that this my will and writing is opened, and according to it, may be my heir, if you do not know where this Jerome may be, you can learn it from Adrian, groom of my chamber, or, in case of his death, from Oger, the porter of my chamber, that he may be treated conformably to the said will and writing.’

‘ This paper,’ Sir William Stirling Maxwell adds, ‘ was one of a parcel of four which seems to have been placed by the emperor in the hands of Philip II. before they took leave of each other on the Flemish shore in September 1556. Folded up within it was the receipt for Jerome, given by Massi, and already cited. It was sealed up with the emperor’s seal, and was endorsed, in his hand, with these words:—“ This my writing is to be opened only by the prince, my son, and failing him by my grandson, Don Carlos ; and failing him by whosoever shall be my heir, conformably to and at the opening of my will.” The other three papers were unsealed, and related to other matters—the executorship of the will in Spain and the Netherlands, and the rights of the King of Spain and the pretensions of others to the kingdom of Navarre and the lordship of Piombino. The whole parcel bore an inscription in the handwriting of Philip with his signature—“ If I die before his Majesty this packet to be delivered to him ; if after him to my son, or, failing him, to my heir.”’ (Vol. i. pp. 22, 23, 8vo edition.)

It is due to Philip II. to say that the injunctions of his father were faithfully and piously observed.

In the autumn of 1559 Philip sailed from the Low Countries to take possession of his Spanish dominions. The story of the meeting and recognition of the brothers has often been told, but it is essential to this sketch, and we quote it in Sir William Stirling Maxwell’s words:—

‘ Processions, triumphal arches, thanksgivings in the churches, and all other displays of civic, courtly, and religious joy celebrated the king’s arrival at Valladolid. The regent Doña Juana resigned the reins of government, and retired, well pleased, to her beads, and prayers, and scourgings, in the pine-shaded cloisters of Abrojo. . . Philip was then at leisure to make the acquaintance of his stranger brother. Luis Quixada was instructed to bring Don John in his ordinary dress on St. Luke’s Day, to meet him at the convent of San Pedro de la Espina. This convent of Bernardines owed its name to the most famous of the relics venerated in its church, a thorn of the crown worn by our Lord on Calvary. Its sumptuous buildings, the pious work of Doña Sancha of Castille, were situated about a league from Villagarcia, on the side of a hill abounding in game. Hither the king was to come on a hunting expedition. Quixada therefore summoned his vassals to join the royal sport. . . . Don John and he then mounted their horses and rode off to the chase, followed by the vassals and servants on foot and

horseback, in their best array. Parties of yeoman-prickers, and the cries of men and hounds in the distance, soon announced the approach of the royal cavalcade. A groom presently met them, leading a very handsome horse. Quixada now dismounted, telling Don John to do the same. The ancient soldier then knelt before his pupil and asked leave to kiss his hand, saying: "You will soon learn from the king himself why I do this." Don John hesitated, but at length held out his hand to be kissed; and when Quixada desired him to mount the new horse, he said gaily to his old friend: "Then since you will have it so, you may also hold the stirrup." They rode onward towards the rocky pass of Torozos. Here a group of gentlemen came in sight. As they drew near, Quixada once more halted, and alighting from his horse caused Don John to follow his example. A short spare man in black, with a pale face and sandy beard, advanced towards them alone, and checked his horse when within a few paces. "Kneel down, Don John," said Quixada, "and kiss his Majesty's hand." As the youth obeyed the instructions, he found bending over him a pair of cold grey eyes and a pouting under lip, which may well have recalled the features of the august invalid whose gouty fingers he had knelt to kiss at Yuste. "Do you know, youngster," said the king, "who your father was?" The abashed youth made no reply. Philip then dismounted, and, embracing him with some show of affection, said: "Charles V., my lord and father, was also yours. You could not have had a more illustrious sire, and I am bound to acknowledge you as my brother." He then turned to the gentlemen behind him and said: "Know and honour this youth as the natural son of the emperor, and as brother to the king." At these words a loud shout burst from the crowd of hunters and peasants who had by this time collected round the spot. Don John, by Philip's desire, remounted his horse, and received the salutations and felicitations of the lords and gentlemen. The real object of the hunting party being now accomplished, the king, who was no sportsman, turned his horse's head towards Valladolid, saying that he had never before captured game which had given him so much pleasure. Don John entered the capital riding at his side, amidst the acclamations of the multitude, amongst whom the news of the recognition of the new prince, the son of their great emperor, had already been promulgated.' (Vol. i. pp. 31-34.)

From that moment Don John assumed his rank as a prince of the House of Austria, distinguished only in some minute particulars from that of the legitimate members of the royal family.

We are compelled to pass over in silence scenes of the Spanish Court which are described with all the pathos and power of our author: the great *auto-de-fe* at Valladolid of May 1559, when not mere Jews, Moriscos, or infidels, but victims of the noblest blood of Castille, were offered up in that holocaust of superstition; and the splendid ceremony in the cathedral of Toledo to take the oath of allegiance to Don

Carlos as heir of the monarchy, at which Don John stood at the head of the nobility of Spain. No greater contrast could be conceived than that between the sullen, misshapen, and morbid heir of so many crowns, and his gay and gallant kinsman who kissed the hand of Don Carlos on that day as the representative of the nation. The contrast of their persons was not greater than the contrast of their fate. Yet the youths started in life together, and, with the exception of one hasty taunt met by a keen repartee, they lived (as we have said) on terms of intimate friendship. In November 1561 Don John, Don Carlos, and with them their cousin Alexander Farnese—destined as Prince of Parma to fill a still broader page of history—were sent to the University of Alcalá.* Their studies were directed by Honorato Juan, a learned Valencian who had been selected by Charles V. to be the preceptor of Philip. He ranked high amongst the men of letters of his time, with the singular distinction that he had written nothing. But it soon became apparent that the tastes and talents of Don John led him away from the ecclesiastical profession to which the emperor had dedicated him, and from the ecclesiastical dignities the king sought to obtain for him. In 1564 the young prince left the University, and in the following year Don John, then eighteen, fired by the approach of the Turkish fleet, broke loose to join the Spanish squadron which had been ordered to the relief of Malta. The enterprise failed, for when he reached Barcelona the galleys had already sailed, and the king imperatively ordered him to return. Few men ever crossed the will of Philip II. with impunity; but when Don John approached him and begged pardon for his flight, the king received him kindly and bade him kiss the hand of the queen. Isabella laughingly asked him if he found the Moors and Turks brave warriors. Probably the king discerned in this boyish adventure that there was more in his brother than the stuff of a cardinal, and that he might fight the Moors and Turks in more serious encounters.

The moment was one which threatened to call forth all the resources of Philip and all the strength of his empire. In the

* Alexander Farnese was born, according to Litha, on August 27, 1545; he was therefore about eighteen months older than Don John. This date is probably correct, but the year of his birth is variously given by different biographies as 1544, 1545, and 1546. In the 'Biographie Universelle' of Michaud, he is stated to have been born in 1555, and to have been married at ten years old, but these evidently are absurd errors.

Low Countries that revolt had broken out which kindled the fires of religious animosity, national enthusiasm, and the spirit of freedom against the dominion of intolerance, an alien rule, and a despotic power. The Duke of Alba was appointed Governor of the Netherlands in August 1567, and began his sanguinary and unsuccessful contest against the liberties of Flanders. In the Eastern seas the Turkish fleets of Solyman and Selim rode supreme. Malta was besieged, and the Turk defied the armaments of Venice and Genoa, and harried the coasts of Southern Italy, Spain, and Spanish Africa. In the ancient kingdom of the Moors brooded a spirit of rebellion, soon to break out in open violence. Moreover, the policy of Philip embraced the whole of Europe: in France, the League; in England, the contest with Elizabeth, suspended at times but never abandoned; in Italy, his varying relations with the Sovereign Pontiff. His emissaries were at work from the Baltic to the Mediterranean. The epoch then about to open was the most momentous in the history of that eventful century. It began with the insurrection of the Low Countries, it ended with the Armada. It included the tragedy of St. Bartholomew's Day in Paris, and the comedy of Anjou's matrimonial adventures in London. The first decade of this period corresponds with the short but brilliant career of Don John of Austria, and it is probable that the prescient mind of Philip foresaw that whilst he directed these complicated movements with his pen from the cells of the Escorial, the arm of his young brother and of his nephew Alexander Farnese were precisely the weapons he required to execute his policy. Certain it is that in October 1567 all mention of the Church was dropped, and Don John received at the king's hands the high office of Admiral of the Fleet, or, as it was termed in Castilian, 'General of the Sea.' His martial predilections were now suffered to have their own way. Don Carlos was so gratified by the appointment that he went from Madrid to the Escorial to thank the king for having made it—a remarkable circumstance, because at that very time Don Carlos was meditating and contriving his own flight from the kingdom, he was arrested two months later, and in the following summer came to his miserable and mysterious end.

Whilst these deplorable events were occurring at Madrid, Don John was absent on his first cruise along the Spanish coast, where he took the command, with the assistance of Don Luis de Requesens as his adviser. The king addressed to him a long letter of excellent counsel and judgment, written with his own hand; and on May 28 he sailed. It is not

improbable that, having regard to the fate of Don Carlos, who was then under arrest, and who died at the end of July, Philip preferred that Don John should be absent from the Court.

This first cruise of Don John led to no immediate results; but it supplied an important element in his education, destined to bear fruit hereafter. The young prince embarked on June 3 at Carthagená, on a royal galley, superbly decorated within and without, amidst the acclamations of the fleet. The squadron of thirty-three sail passed along the southern coast of Spain, visited Oran, reached Cadiz, inspected the maritime defences of the kingdom, and above all won for the young commander the goodwill and confidence of the navy. Towards the end of September Don John returned to the Court at Madrid; in the interval the catastrophe of Don Carlos had occurred, and a few days later the amiable and accomplished Queen Isabella, in her twenty-fourth year, died in premature childbed.

‘Sincerely mourned by her lord, whose regard for her is one of the redeeming features of his character, Isabella of the Peace, by her beauty and goodness, the auspicious circumstances of her marriage, and her early death, found a high place, which her memory long retained, in the popular affection of Spain. The night after her decease, as the fair corpse lay in state amidst a forest of tapers in the chapel of the palace, the king came at midnight to pray beside the bier. The courtiers whom he had chosen to attend upon him, and who stood motionless behind, as he knelt at the head of his dead wife, were Don John of Austria, Ferdinand de Toledo, and the Prince of Eboli.’ (Vol. i. p. 110.)

A chapter is here interposed on the military marine of the Mediterranean in the sixteenth century, which was to play so glorious a part in the future career of Don John. These details are of great interest to the naval history of Europe, and they are collected, for the most part, from original sources. ‘If there be a hell in this world,’ said a rhymist for the people in that age, ‘it is in the galleys, where rest is unknown.’ Hard work, hard fare, hard usage, exposure to all kinds of weather and to many kinds of danger, the utter absence of any comfort or sympathy in suffering, or any protection from wrong, the perpetual presence of cruel tormentors and vile companions, tasked to the utmost man’s animal instinct to cling to life. The galleys were at once the instrument of punishment and of warfare. Chained to those pitiless benches and those unwieldy oars, the captive, the criminal, the heretic, men of different races and degrees, were doomed to a common suffering, and subject to the same barbarity. The Christian

galleys were manned in part by Moslem slaves, the Turkish fleet by Christian prisoners, so that in war each side was exposed to the fire of its own countrymen. No form of human misery, of which we have read or heard, seems comparable to that of the galley slave at the oar; yet it was endured for years, and the vessels propelled by the arms of these wretched beings bore their masters to fame and victory.

The time was not yet come, however, for Don John to enter upon his naval exploits. He had before him a different task. After the death of the queen he withdrew for some weeks to a convent at Abrojo, near Valladolid, famous for the austerity of its rule—a singular retreat for a young and gallant officer—but there the news of the formidable rebellion of the Moriscos reached him. A fervent hatred of the Moslem and an eager desire to serve the king fired his ambition, and he addressed to Philip the following letter:—

‘ S.(acred) C.(atholic) R.(oyal) M.(ajesty), .

‘ My obligation to serve your Majesty, and the natural faith and love to your Majesty, induce me, with the greatest submission, to propose that which appears to me fitting. I informed your Majesty of my arrival in this Court, and of the cause of my coming hither; and I did not think that there was any occasion to trouble your Majesty with letters of so little worth as mine. I have now heard of the state of the rebellion of the Moriscos of Granada, and of the distress in that city, on suspicion becoming certainty; and as the reparation of your Majesty’s reputation, honour, and grandeur, insulted by the boldness of these malecontents, touches me very nearly, I cannot restrain myself within the obedience and entire submission of myself in all things to your Majesty’s will, which I have always evinced, nor help representing my desire, and entreating your Majesty that, as it is the glory of kings to be constant in the bestowal of their favours, and to raise up and make men by their power, your Majesty will use me, who am of your making, in the chastisement of these people, because it is known that I may be trusted beyond most others, and that no one will act more vigorously against these wretches than I. I confess that they are not people who deserve to be made of great account; but because even vile minds grow proud if they possess any strength, and this is not, as I am advised, wanting to these rebels; and because this power should be taken from them: and the Marquess of Mondejar, not being sufficiently strong for this purpose (he having, as I am told, fallen out with the president, and being but little and unwillingly obeyed); and as some person must be sent thither, and my nature leads me to these pursuits, and I am as obedient to your Majesty’s royal will as the clay to the hand of the potter, it appeared to me that I should be wanting in love and inclination and duty towards your Majesty, if I did not offer myself for this post. Although I know that those who serve your Majesty are safe in your royal hands, and ought not to ask, yet I trust that what I have done may be considered rather a merit than a fault. If I

obtain the position which is the object of my desire, I shall be sufficiently rewarded. To this end I came from Abrojo, which, but for the sake of your Majesty's service, and the importance of the occasion, I should not have ventured to do without the express command of your Majesty. May our Lord preserve, for many years, the sacred and Catholic person of your Majesty. From the lodgings, this 30th day of December 1568, of your Majesty's creature and most humble servant, who kisses your royal hands.

‘D. JUAN DE AUSTRIA.’

In the following month of March his request was granted, and on April 6, 1569, Don John proceeded in command to Granada.

The tale of the Morisco rebellion has been often and ably told. The materials are abundant in the histories of Mendoza, of Marmol, and of Hita—the first two of whom were eyewitnesses of that wild and varied warfare. These have been largely used by Count Albert de Circourt in his excellent work, ‘*Les Arabes en Espagne*,’ and by Mr. Prescott in his ‘*Life of Philip II.*’ Sir William Stirling Maxwell has not materially added to these well-known sources; but he has related the expeditions of Mondejar, Los Velez, and Don John, and the desperate resistance of the persecuted race, with the utmost spirit and vivacity. No war within so narrow a field ever presented so many incidents of romantic heroism, of ferocious cruelty on both sides, and of subtle policy. It was the death-struggle of the Creseent and the Cross in Western Europe, and if the field was narrow and the forces small, it called forth the fiercest passions of man, urged on by religion, by race, by patriotism, and by cruel wrongs. We shall not attempt to follow this part of the narrative. But the following description of the scene of this internecine strife, in the Alpu-xarras, deserves to be quoted for its remarkable elegance:—

‘In natural beauty, and in many physical advantages, this mountain land is one of the most lovely and delightful regions of Europe. Possessing a variety of climate elsewhere almost unknown, it might be made to yield to man most of the products of the earth. From the tropical heat and luxuriance, the sugar canes and the palm trees, of the lower valleys, and of the narrow plain which skirts the sea like a golden zone, it is but a step through gardens, steep corn-fields and olive groves, to fresh alpine pastures and woods of pine, above which vegetation expires on the rocks where snow lies long and deep, and is still found in nooks and hollows in the burning days of autumn. When thickly peopled with laborious Moors, the narrow glens, bottomed with rich soil, were terraced and irrigated with a careful industry which compensated for want of space. The villages, each nestling in its hollow, or perched on a craggy height, were surrounded by vineyards

and gardens, orange and almond orchards, and plantations of olive and mulberry hedged with the cactus and the aloe; above, on the rocky uplands were heard the bells of sheep and kine; and the wine and fruit, the silk and oil, the cheesc and the wool of the Alpuxarras, were famous in the markets of Granada and the seaports of Andalusia. The seashore of this region is in some parts, as between Adra and the Sierra de Gador, a plain once rich with sugar and cotton; in others, as between Adra and Salobreña, a range of vine-covered hills, broken here and there with vegas at the mouths of rivers, where the finest products of the South still cover the alluvial soil with an emerald verdure. On the hills, above the vines, the rocks are dotted with spreading fig-trees or the dark round-headed ash, and higher up, with the palmetto and a few pines: and the white watch-towers of the Moors, placed on headlands about a league apart, sparkle like pearls on the cliffs overhanging the sea. Such was the fair province which, by the toil of a simple and harmless race, had flourished through ages of misrule, which Christian bigotry had condemned to the horrors of a winter campaign, and the superstition of the priest had given over to the soldier's fire and sword.

'The country was admirably adapted for that petty warfare for which Spain has always been famous. The greater valleys are for the most part of their length extremely narrow, and bounded by precipitous hills, and they branched into glens so numerous and intricate, and so like each other in character, that it was a hopeless task for a stranger to pilot his course through their endless ramifications. Even those parts of the country which seem comparatively open prove on closer inspection to be furrowed with hidden ravines. Thus in passing eastward from the valley of Mccina, one of the chief glens of the southern face of Muleyhacen, the traveller sees before him what appears a vast undulating district, rich with cultivation, and studded with white towers, over which he hopes to find an easy and pleasant track. No sooner, however, has he entered it than he is once more compelled to fathom unexpected gorges and climb unforeseen ridges; and the rugged descent of the Sierra is hardly less toilsome than his progress to Valor or Uxixar. If he turns his face southwards, towards Cadiar, he finds himself on what might have been a storm-lashed sea turned to stone, so rugged and arbitrary is the labyrinth of naked ravines through and over which lies his difficult and wearisome path. The winding tracks which traversed the country were at every turn commanded by some beetling crag or tuft of brushwood, from whence a musket or a cross-bow could securely dispose of an approaching foe. Each hamlet, embowered in its fruit-trees and fenced with its outworks of aloe and cactus, was a natural stronghold; and if the inhabitants were driven from it, the Sierra above usually had its cavern where women and children might be sheltered, and household goods and treasure safely concealed. Even in the vegas by the seashore, the trees which, hung with tangled trailers, generally skirted the river's bed, the tall reeds which hedged and overhung the narrow pathways between the fields, afforded a thousand points where a well-armed resolute peasantry might withstand with success the soldiers of the king.

‘Within a week the whole region was in arms, from the valley of Lecrin to the plain of Almeria, from the vega of Granada to the shore of the Mediterranean. Village after village, rising against its civil and religious authorities, destroyed or expelled them. The same bloody drama was acted at once in a hundred scenes, which the bounteous hand of nature had formed to be abodes of beauty, plenty, and peace. News came to a hamlet that its neighbouring population, down the glen or across the hill, had risen; that a great army had landed from Africa; and that Granada and Alhambra once more belonged to the Moors. The Moriscos gathered in the street to hear the tidings and discuss the course to be taken. The Christians, if they were few and timid, fled; the curate stealing into his sacristy and securing the host from desecration by swallowing it. If they were bold and numerous, they assembled in the church and considered their means of defence. Their usual resolution was to shut themselves up with their women, children, and valuables, in the belfry, confiding in the strength of its masonry, and trusting that their hastily-collected stock of provisions might hold out until succour should arrive. The Moors were meanwhile proclaiming with cymbal and horn, and shouts of joy, that there was but one God, and that Mahomet was his prophet.’ (Vol. i. pp. 127–129.)

The rebellion was allowed to spread through the province by the monstrous impolicy of the Crown to its Moorish subjects, and by the inconceivable procrastination of the king. The Marquis of Mondejar and the Marquis of Los Velez exercised a divided authority, and followed a conflicting policy—the one being in favour of conciliation, the other of extreme severity. The king’s forces were ill-supported, and suffered repeated defeats. When Don John arrived at Granada, the Moors were almost within sight of the city, and his own powers were limited by a board of officers, who had to report everything to the king. He himself was condemned to inaction. Many months elapsed before he was permitted to take the field, and even then the king’s chief anxiety seems to have been to protect his daring kinsman from personal danger. Their correspondence is curious, and on the part of Don John modest and graceful.

‘With Don John himself the king remonstrated against his going out with skirmishing parties to harass or surprise the enemy. “I heard with regret,” he wrote, “that you had been out the other day on one of these expeditions, because it does not befit you, nor is it your duty, which is to watch over the safety of the city. . . . If a large force went with you, the Moriscos might appear on the other side, and effect something which might be inconvenient; so you must do this no more. Even if the Duke of Sesa and Luis Quixada go with you, that is not right, for one of them ought to look after such things, and the other remain with you. I have also heard that

“ you go and visit the sentinels, and watch the patrols on their rounds :
“ this should not be done by you too often ; only from time to time
“ when circumstances require it.”

‘ Don John was very averse to shutting himself up in Granada if there was anything to be done against the enemy in which he could take a part. “ If I had more experience and practice in my profession,” he wrote, “ I should have nothing to reply to your Majesty, but seeing that I am only learning the service in which I hope to die, it is not right that I should miss what opportunities there are of improving myself in it, and besides, I know that it does not suit your Majesty’s affairs. I entreat you to observe how little it befits me, being what I am, or my age, that I should shut myself up, when I ought to be showing myself abroad.” In vain the king replied : “ You must keep yourself, and I must keep you, for greater things, and it is from these that you must learn your professional knowledge.” Don John’s reasonable and spirited rejoinder was : “ I am certainly most desirous to give satisfaction to your Majesty, and do in all things as you wish ; but at my age, and in my position, I see that your Majesty’s interest requires that when there is any call to arms or any enterprise, the soldiers should find me in front of them, or at least with them, ready to encourage them to do their duty, and that they should know that I desire to lead them in the name of your Majesty.”’ (Vol. i. pp. 182, 183.)

The generals quarrelled, the soldiers deserted, the army lived by pillage : it was not till the winter of 1570 that the king allowed it to take the field, in two divisions, one commanded by Don John, the other by the Duke of Sesa. The hour of action had at last arrived, and the young prince advanced against the stronghold of the Moors at Galera. The siege was conducted with energy and ability, and, in spite of two sanguinary repulses, the town, being undermined, fell on February 10. The Spaniards had been exasperated to the last degree by the stubborn resistance of the place, and by the defeats they had sustained under its walls. Don John himself shared their passion, and it is a blot on his fame that on this, his first memorable deed of war, he ordered or allowed a frightful butchery of the wretched people after their surrender. Mr. Prescott denounces this ‘ atrocious massacre.’ Sir William throws some doubt on the matter. It seems certain that four thousand four hundred women and children were made prisoners, about three thousand fighting men perished, and the town was demolished. The fall of that ‘ proud galley,’ as the poets of the day termed the Galera of the mountains, did not terminate the struggle. Don John next proceeded to attack Seron, another stronghold of the Moorish garrison. There he encountered a similar resistance, and at first a similar check. There, too, Quixada, the foster-father, the guide, the friend of

his childhood and his youth, fell, struck by a Moorish ball, by his side. Another ball glanced from his own helmet. The loss of Quixada touched him to the heart, and wrung a rare expression of grief from Philip himself. Soon after this event Seron was evacuated. Don John pursued a rapid career of success. Negotiations were opened with El Habaqui, one of the Moorish chiefs, and although the war was renewed for a short time by Aben Aboo, who rejected all compromise, and caused El Habaqui to be killed as a traitor, the insurrection was finally crushed, the Moriscos were scattered in the adjacent provinces of Mercia and Valencia, and it was not until the next reign that the Church and the Crown expelled the most industrious and intelligent of their subjects from the Peninsula. The contest had done no credit to the policy of the king or to the conduct of the Spanish troops, but it had unquestionably raised the reputation of Don John of Austria; he was acknowledged by the army to be a worthy son of the great emperor; he had shown valour and skill in war; he was disposed to show forbearance and temper in negotiation. The time was come when a higher destiny awaited him. On the last day of November 1570, he was recalled by the king from Granada to Madrid. The conqueror of the Morisco, king of the Alpuxarras, and of a few mountain towns, was to lead the fleets and armies of Spain, Venice, and the Pope in a new crusade against the Moslem tyrant of the Mediterranean.

At the death of Solyman the Magnificent in 1566 the Ottoman Power had attained the apogee of its greatness. The battles of Mohacs and Essek had placed Hungary at the feet of the Moslem; the Turkish armies had occupied Ispahan; the naval exploits of Barbarossa had subdued the Mediterranean. He was courted by France, he was feared by Spain. Such was the empire that passed to Selim II., the son of Solyman, and the descendant of a shepherd chief of the Bithynian highlands.

‘By the scimitars of nine stout Sultans the kingdoms of Selim had been won from the marshalled hosts of civilisation, or from the fierce hordes of the desert. While he himself reigned in the palace of the Cæsars by the shores of the Bosphorus, his Viceroys gave law in the halls of the Caliphs at Bagdad in the east, or collected tribute beneath the shadow of Atlas in the west. From Aden in the south his banner, emblazoned with the crossed scimitars, was unfurled to the Indian Sea; and at Buda in the north his Pashas quaffed their sherbet in the libraries and the galleries of the poet-king Matthias. The Shah of Persia, the Chief of the Holy Roman Empire, and the proud Republics of Genoa and Venice, were reckoned amongst the vassals whose tribute swelled his annual revenue. From the headlands of

Istria to the cliffs of Kent the cruisers of his seaports levied a tax on the coasts of Christendom and the commerce of the world.' (Vol. i. pp. 289, 290.)

Yet already, in passing to the weaker son of the great Sultan, the seeds of dissolution were sown in the empire, and ere long a blow was to be struck at Turkish greatness.

It is a mistake to suppose that during the sixteenth century an incessant struggle was carried on between the Porte and Venice or Spain. The last twenty-eight years of the reign of Solyman were marked by no naval contest, because the Turkish maritime supremacy was complete—a striking proof of what may be the naval power of an empire seated on the Bosphorus, and disposing of the resources of the adjacent coasts. Against such a power Venice was too weak to contend. The whole political skill of the republic was applied to preserve peace, to retain her own possessions, in Cyprus and the Archipelago, and to protect the Adriatic coast from her formidable neighbour.

'The relations between the republic, proud of her ancient fame yet conscious of declining power, and the Ottoman, riding on the flood-tide of prosperity, demanded on the Venetian side the most delicate and dexterous handling. To humour the arrogant barbarian, avoiding exasperating opposition on the one hand and tame submission on the other, was well compared, by one of the ablest hands in the game, "to play with a ball of glass, which must be kept in the air by slight and skilful touches, and would be broken either by a fall or a violent blow."' (Vol. i. p. 296.)

Selim II. was no warrior, and his life was spent in gross sensual indulgence and crimes.

'In person he was said to have resembled in early life his Russian mother, the famous Roxalana, whose imperious temper he had inherited without her vigorous understanding. His disorderly life had, however, long ago effaced all traces of her transmitted beauty. Excess, both in eating and drinking (for he was said to remain sometimes for whole days and nights at table, and to drink a bottle of spirits every morning by way of aiding his digestion), had bloated his cheek and dulled his eye. He was, however, not a little proud of his crimson complexion, and dyed his hands and face to a blood colour. To the western stranger, who was led through the wide courts of the Seraglio, between long ranks of janissaries, terrible and silent as death, to the barbaric pomp of his presence-chamber, or who beheld him riding at noon to mosque, glittering with gems, amongst his gilded and jewelled cavaliers, the little fiery-faced infidel with his beard dyed jet, his blackened eyelids, and his huge turban, must have appeared the very personification of the fierce and wicked heathen tyrant of chivalrous romance.

'If his brief reign belong to the splendid period of Turkish history ;

if it produced some of the chief monuments of Mahometan legislation, and added several Arabian provinces and the royal isle of Cyprus to the dominions of the Crown; if the Selimye mosque, whose airy domes and delicate spires so nobly crown the city of Adrian, equals, or perhaps excels, the temples left to Constantinople by Solyman and Justinian, the glory of these achievements is due not to the indolent monarch who soiled the throne with the foulest vices, but to the unexhausted impulse of a better time, and to that able band of renegades and soldiers of fortune trained in the school of Solyman—quick-witted Greeks and Italians, bold Albanians, patient Bosnians and Croats—who bartered their genius and valour for the gold of the slothful Turk.’ (Vol. i. p. 301.)

Selim had not been long upon the throne when he cast his eyes on Cyprus. It was an axiom of Turkish policy that to preserve the empire was to extend it; and in spite of the opposition of the sagacious Grand Vizier, Mahomet Sokolli, an expedition was fitted out against Cyprus, war was proclaimed against Venice, and Barbaro, the Venetian Bailo at the Porte (whose biography we owe to M. Yriarte), was sent to the Seven Towers. In March 1570 the Turkish armament was almost ready to sail. Never was the republic in greater peril. The Turk could launch two hundred and fifty vessels of war. The arsenal of Venice had recently been devastated by a conflagration. The Senate was aware that they could not hold their own at sea, or protect their islands, against so powerful an enemy. Every effort was made by Barbaro to parry the blow, at Constantinople. Every Court in Europe was applied to for aid by the Venetian envoys, but with small success. As for Spain, the spring of 1570 was the last crisis of the Morisco war, and the king was still agitated by the catastrophe of his son Don Carlos. He received the overtures of Venice with marked coldness and reserve. In this her hour of need, the Queen of the Adriatic found help but in one quarter whence she least expected it. But Pope Pius V. saw, with an intuition of genius, that the moment had arrived when the long struggle of the Cross and the Crescent for supremacy in the Mediterranean must be fought out. It is said that Cosmo de’ Medici had pointed out to his Holiness in 1568 that a maritime league of Venice, Spain, and the Pope could alone make head against the Turk. Pius, the master of two worn-out galleys, adopted the design, and applied himself to direct this new crusade against the infidel, with the same energy he had directed against the liberties and the religion of Protestant England. The name of Pius V. is odious in English history, because he was a mortal enemy of our Sovereign and our Church; but as the author of the Holy League this memorable

Pope was the saviour of the liberties of Southern Europe. Sir William Stirling Maxwell has drawn a striking portrait of this pontiff, and like all the other portraits of his heroes, it is accompanied by a reproduction of the *vera effigies*, from the masculine engravings of the age of Titian and Tintoretto. The passage concludes in the following words:—

‘In Pius V. we may perhaps find one of the best specimens which history affords of that terrible creature, a perfect priest, a man seriously believing himself invested with mysterious power from above, resigned, in all singleness of heart, to follow the behests of his religion wherever they may lead, and ready actually to do that which most of its votaries are content merely to say ought to be done. Seldom has a better nature been marred by the evil touch of fanaticism. Brave, just, and gentle, he might as a layman have led a life wholly blameless and beneficent. Even as a churchman he remained unspotted from the world of corruption wherein he dwelt, and, as pope, for six years bore chief rule. His dealings with the property and patronage of the Roman see contrasted strangely with the shameless nepotism of other Pontiffs, and of his immediate predecessor. On a sister’s grandson, once a tailor’s runaway apprentice, he, no doubt, bestowed a red hat; but the provision made for the youth was modest indeed compared with the splendid endowments which generally fell to Papal nephews. In the service of God and the Church, of course, Pius shrank from no atrocity and no absurdity. He praised and rewarded the massacres of Alba; he was an active member of the Ridolfi conspiracy against the life of Queen Elizabeth; and he was ready, as he wrote to Philip II., to give his last shirt and last chalice to compass her assassination. He forbade medical aid to be given to those of his sick soldiers who had neglected their religious duties, although on their bodily vigour in some measure depended their efficient slaughter of Huguenots. But his career affords no evidence that he ever stooped to that which he himself believed to be base. In the service of his religion he did much wrong; but he was at all times ready to die for that which his conscience, such as his religion had made it, told him was right. While other Popes, superior to him in intellectual ability and political skill, were absorbed in the aggrandisement of nephews, or at best of the Papacy, Pius V. conceived a nobler policy, and, looking beyond the Italian peninsula and the Roman Church, laboured for what he believed to be the interests of Christianity and civilisation.’ (Vol. i. pp. 329, 330.)

The league was not formed without difficulty; the negotiations carried on at Rome under the eye of the Pope lasted a year. Meanwhile the campaign of 1570 was a complete failure; Cyprus was conquered by the Turks; Nicosia fell, Famagosta was invested; the quarrels between the Venetian admirals and Doria, who commanded the Spanish squadron, had paralysed the action of the Christian fleet. Everything depended on the nomination of the Captain-General for the

ensuing year. The choice was awarded to the Pope, and with equal policy and good fortune Pius V. named Don John of Austria to the superior command. 'Homo missus est à Deo cui nomen Joannes,' exclaimed the venerable Pontiff, when he received and saluted the victor of Lepanto. Marc Antonio Colonna, a Roman officer of great tact and judgment, was appointed his second. Upon that appointment turned great issues. The young prince was placed, as it were by Providence, at the head of the Christian forces of the South, to engage in one of those contests which decide the destinies of empires.

The Holy League was publicly inaugurated at the Vatican on May 25, 1571. Venice, meanwhile, had continued to negotiate with the Grand Vizier for peace, and the transactions between Jacobo Ragazzoni, Barbaro, and the Porte are curious. They appear to have been imperfectly known to M. Yriarte in his life of the Patrician. But they failed, and on June 18 the emissary returned to Venice. Although the Christian alliance was concluded and its articles published to the world,

'it soon' appeared that Venice and Spain differed widely as to the scope and objects of the League. The Republic conceived these objects to be, first, the recovery of Cyprus, and, secondly, the infliction of some signal blow upon the naval power of the Sultan, and the setting of some limit to the extension of his territories. Within the rough gauntlet of the infidel foe, Venice well knew that there was a hand which, perhaps at no great distance of time, it would be her policy to grasp in friendship.

'The King of Spain, on the other hand, held in the west of the Mediterranean the position which the Sultan held in the Levant. The permanent humiliation of the one monarch was the natural end and aim of the other. Without some hope of approaching this end, Philip II. would not have entered into a close alliance with the Doge and Senate, whom he viewed with hatred and distrust. Granvelle, therefore, insisted that the League, instead of restricting itself to any specific object, should be a perpetual confederation against the enemies of the Christian name, and should be prepared to act at any moment, not only against the Sultan, but against the Shah of Persia in the East, or against the Western Moors, who still looked with jealous and vindictive eyes to the snowy mountain-tops behind their beloved Granada. . . .

'The Republic entered the League with manifest reluctance. The treaty was not publicly promulgated at Venice until July 2. On that day Don Diego de Guzman de Silva, the ambassador of the Catholic king, being a churchman, said mass at St. Mark's before the Doge and Senate. A grand procession of all the dignitaries of Church and State afterwards passed, like a stream of crimson and gold, around the beautiful piazza, which was richly tapestried from roof to pavement;

and a herald proclaimed to the multitude "the perpetual league and " confederacy, made by the grace of God and the Virgin, and the " means of his Holiness the Pope, against the Turk." Whatever may have been the forebodings of some of the noble senators, the announcement was highly pleasing to the populace, who swelled with their shouts the roar of the cannon. The Jews, from east and west, whose yellow turbans and red hats largely variegated the crowd, made haste to convey the ominous news to those who were sure to turn it to profit, their kinsmen in the Seraglio of the Sultan and the marts of the Levant.

'The League was accepted by the Doge and Senate not so much on account of the advantages which it offered as because of the impossibility of concluding peace on reasonable terms with Sultan Selim. The hatred entertained towards Venice by that drunken despot had not been softened by the success of his arms. Eager for the renewal of active hostilities, he had not only overruled the pacific policy of his Grand Vizier, but he had removed Piali Pasha from the command of the fleet before Cyprus, because that leader had not attacked, in the past autumn, the harmless allied armament under Colonna. He would listen to no terms of peace but the surrender of Cyprus without compensation or condition. In early summer a great fleet, swelled by contingents from Tripoli, Alexandria, and Algiers, and amounting to two hundred and fifty sail, blockaded the devoted island, and sent out squadrons to carry fire and sword into the Venetian possessions in Candia, Cephalonia, and Zante. The agent of the Republic at Constantinople wrote to the Doge and Senate that no course was left but war, no possible issue but victory or destruction.' (Vol. i. pp. 342, 343.)

Notwithstanding the urgency of the case, for the siege of Famagosta was prosecuted by the Turks with unrelenting vigour, a space of time which to modern experience appears extraordinary was suffered to elapse before the League proceeded to action. Don John of Austria set out from Madrid on June 6 with his suite. He rode to Barcelona—a ten days' journey. Time was spent in stately receptions, splendid processions, religious ceremonies, and a pilgrimage to the image of Our Lady of Montserrat, to whom Don John entertained a particular devotion. At Barcelona he assumed his new command, but it was not till July 26 that he steered into the harbour of Genoa.

'Landing on the stately quays of the proud city, Don John and his companions were received with all honour by the Doge and Signiory, and conducted to that famous palace of the Dorias, which, with its massive front and broad terraces shaded with orange-tree alleys, still forms so fine a feature in that unrivalled amphitheatre of hill, city, and sea. Here the great admiral, Andrea Doria, had several times entertained with princely magnificence his master and friend Charles V.; and here, reposing from fatigue by sea or land, the tasteful Lord of Naples and Granada was wont to declare that he never was so

splendidly lodged as in the halls of the Dorias. Here, on the terrace, forming the centre of a graceful fountain, stood, and still stands, the statue of the great seaman portrayed in the character of Neptune. On the slope of the hill-garden behind towered a colossal Jupiter, resting one foot on the head of a wolf-hound, to mark the site of the grave of a favourite dog given to his admiral by Charles V. The naval triumphs of Andrea and the noble architecture of his house had received worthy illustration and adornments from the fine pencil of Pierino del Vaga and other famous artists; and Don John, on his way to meet the fleets of Selim, was fired with emulation by beholding the vivid representations of the actions of his father and his gallant comrades against the armies, the strongholds, and the navies of Solyman.' (Vol. i. pp. 355, 356.)

In these storied halls Doria gave a masked ball to his illustrious guests, at which the commander of the Holy League bewitched the world with his incomparable dancing: the 'agilità et grazia' of Don John could not be credited by any one who had not seen him, and 'ognuno restò stupido et sodis-fatissimo della dispostezza et grazia di sua Altezza.' Thence he proceeded to Naples, where

'three days later, on August 14, he went in state to the conventual church of Sta. Clara to receive the general's staff and the standard of the League, the gift of the Pope, which Granvelle had been charged by his Holiness to deliver to him with all possible pomp and solemnity. The Franciscan friars of Sta. Clara met him at their great portal chanting the *Te Deum*, and led him, with the young heirs of the Houses of Farnese and Della Rovere on either hand, to the steps of the high altar. Mass having been said by Granvelle, arrayed in his most sumptuous robes, Don John mounted the steps, and, kneeling in front of the altar, received from the hands of the cardinal the gifts of the father of the Christian world. The banner of the Holy League was of blue damask; in its centre was elaborately wrought the image of our crucified Redeemer; beneath that sacred effigy were linked together the scutcheon of the Pope, displaying three blood-red bars on a silver field, the lion shield of the Republic of St. Mark, and the shield of many quarterings of the chief of the House of Austria, while, lower still, the design ended in the arms of Don John himself. "Take, "fortunate Prince," said Granvelle, in his sonorous voice, "take these "emblems of the Word made flesh, these symbols of the true faith, "and may they give thee a glorious victory over our impious enemy, "and by thy hand may his pride be laid low!" "Amen," said the young commander; and the choir and the multitude replied "Amen!"' (Vol. i. p. 359.)

The forces of the League were at last collected at Messina, which was the appointed rallying-place, not without grim dissatisfaction on the part of old Veniero, who commanded the Venetian squadron of ninety-four galleys. He was eager to

sail to the relief of the beleaguered garrison in Cyprus; he regarded the Spaniards with Venetian jealousy, and he was reluctant to leave the Adriatic undefended against the Moslem rovers. The siege of Famagosta—a spot now so important to ourselves, and so famous in history—was, and is, says Sir William, the main point of interest, because it was the sole fortress in Cyprus where the banner of St. Mark still floated, and where a gallant band of Christians, far from their homes and countrymen, stood at bay against the mighty enemy of their race and name. In these pages the siege is related with prodigious spirit and effect. It ended with a dreadful catastrophe. In vain the gallant defenders of the town hoped for relief that never came. Baglioni and Bragadino immortalised themselves by a desperate defence; but on August 1 they were reduced to capitulate; the terms of the surrender were infamously broken by Mustafa, the Turkish general, who caused his prisoners to be massacred with peculiar atrocity. Cyprus fell under the power of the Moslem, and remained a dependency of the Ottoman Empire, oppressed, impoverished, and denuded of her ancient splendour, from that fatal hour until the island passed, in our own times, under the protection of Great Britain.

Venice herself had certainly not the power to resist the Turkish attack on Cyprus, or to relieve Famagosta. Her naval armament was the least effective portion of the allied fleet.

‘While waiting for the rest of the armament, Don John of Austria, as we have said, devoted some of his time to inspecting that part of it which was already at Messina. The squadron of the Pope he found to be in excellent order. But in the galleys of Venice he saw more to justify the timid forebodings of La Corguia than the fiery counsels of old Veniero. He thus described what he saw there to Don Garcia de Toledo:—“Yesterday (August 29) I began to visit the galleys of the
“Venetians, and went on board the flagship. You cannot believe
“what bad order both the soldiers and sailors were in. Arms and
“artillery certainly they have; but as fighting is not to be done with-
“out men, a certain spasm takes me when I see with what materials I
“am expected by the world to do something of importance, knowing
“that my galleys will be counted by numbers and not by quality.
“Nevertheless, I will endeavour to lose no chance of showing that I
“have done my share of the duty, in which I shall find your advice
“of great use. To the ill condition of things on board the Venetians,
“another thing even worse must be added, that no kind of order
“seems to prevail amongst them, and each galley appears to come and
“go as each captain pleases. Fine grounds, indeed, for their anxiety
“for fighting!”’ (Vol. i. p. 380.)

This weakness of the Venetian galleys was partly remedied by putting Spanish troops on board of them. But this expedient gave rise to disputes, ever ready to break out between the confederates. Fortunately Don John succeeded in maintaining his authority and his close union with Colonna, the commander of the Roman squadron. He passed the mighty armament in review; upwards of three hundred sail and eighty thousand men obeyed his commands; the greatest power, certainly, that had floated on those historic waters since the fall of the Roman Empire. Confident in his strength and in his cause, at the council of war held on September 10 he declared his purpose of sailing immediately in search of the enemy. Colonna and Veniero supported him, Doria and La Corgnia (a Venetian who commanded the land forces) were for delay. But the spirit and resolution of Don John bore down all opposition. He would sail forthwith and bring the Turk to battle, and, with the aid of God and the brave men around him, he was confident of obtaining a splendid victory.

On September 16 the whole forest of masts which had so long filled the harbour of Messina was in motion. The armada sailed in three divisions: the green, or right wing, commanded by Andrea Doria; the centre of sixty-four galleys under the blue pennant of Don John of Austria; the yellow, consisting of the Venetian squadron, under Barbarigo; whilst a rear-guard of thirty vessels followed under the white flag of the Marquis of Santa Cruz. The bursting of a brilliant meteor after nightfall was held to be an omen of success. But the voyage was not altogether prosperous. It is remarkable that an expedition of such importance should have sailed precisely at the time of the autumnal equinox, when bad weather was to be expected. Accordingly, Don John was driven back to his anchorage by foul winds and stormy seas, and it was not till the 26th that the mountains of Corfu, crowned with the dark peak of San Salvador, were in sight. The commanders landed at Corfu, then belonging to the Venetians, though the Turks had recently attacked and pillaged the town. There they obtained important information as to the strength and movements of the enemy from a renegade named Baffo, and a council of war was held.

‘When the important meeting was summoned it was very fully attended. Besides Veniero, Barbarigo, Colonna, Requesens, and Doria, there were present Santa Cruz, Ascanio de la Corgnia, Cardona, Orsini, Priego, Miguel de Moncada, the Princes of Parma and Urbino, and others. They were aware of the magnitude of the question they were about to decide, and knew that on their decision depended the

honour and safety of the great States of the Christian world. After infinite difficulties—difficulties with which several members of this memorable council themselves had had personally to grapple—the chief Christian powers had assembled the greatest armament which had ever been arrayed against the common enemy. It was obvious that a wrong move, resulting in a disaster, would place Europe at the feet of the fierce Asiatic conqueror. But it was no less apparent that a timid and procrastinating policy, seeking to avoid a disaster, might have an effect, hardly less fatal, of resolving the great armament of the League into its original discordant elements, of breaking it up again into separate fleets, no one of which would be able to face the navy of Selim. It happened, by a fortunate coincidence, that while the forces of Christendom were joined, those of the Turk were divided. One portion of the Ottoman fleet was in the Gulf of Lepanto, another was still far away in the Levant, engaged in the blockade of Cyprus. Ali Pasha, who commanded in the waters of Lepanto, was a sufficiently formidable foe; but, if he were to be joined by the squadron from Cyprus, he might be more than a match for the League. If ever there was a moment, therefore, in which daring was true discretion, that moment had now arrived.' (Vol. i. p. 391.)

Some voices were raised for that extreme caution which, under the circumstances, was extreme rashness; but the bolder and wiser views of Don John of Austria happily prevailed. It was resolved to go at once in search of the enemy, to follow him if he retired, and to spare no effort to bring on a decisive battle. Yet at this critical moment a dispute arose which might have led to serious consequences. Old Veniero, the Venetian admiral, resented the interference of one Mucio Tortona, an Italian captain in the Spanish service who had been placed on one of the Venetian galleys, and without more ado caused him to be hanged, with two other men, at the yard-arm of the admiral's ship. Don John was naturally indignant at such a proceeding, but with infinite tact and self-command he judged that this was not the moment to resent it.

Gil de Andrade had been sent forward to obtain information of the position of the Turkish fleet. The Greeks whom he had fallen in with on the coast, assured him that the Christians might offer battle with every assurance of victory; but these same Greeks had also furnished intelligence to the cruisers of Ali Pasha equally favourable to his hopes.

The Turkish armament was commanded by Ali Pasha, a brave and skilful sailor who perished in the action; by Hassan Pasha, a son of the famous Barbarossa; and by Aluch Ali, a Calabrian renegade who had risen from the condition of a galley-slave to the rank of Viceroy of Algiers. These officers, too, differed in opinion. Hamet Bey, the Governor of Negropont, advised that the Turkish force should remain under the

castles of Lepanto: and his opinion was not unsupported. Hassan Pasha and Ali Pasha were in favour of fighting; and decisive orders arrived from Constantinople to capture the Christian fleet and bring it to the Golden Horn.

The Gulf of Patras is a long inlet dividing the Morea from the coast of Albania, which narrows, about twenty-five miles to the east of the point of Missolonghi, into a strait commanded by the castles of Lepanto, a position which in fact intersects the gulf. The eastern bay is the true Gulf of Lepanto, extending to the Isthmus of Corinth. It was in the western bay, or Gulf of Patras, that the action was fought, although it bears in history another name. The Turkish armament lay in perfect security in front of the Dardanelles of Lepanto, protected by the castles in its rear. It is surprising that the Turks did not await the attack of the enemy in so strong a position.

‘On October 3, at dawn, Don John of Austria was once more under way. He was soon abreast of the town of Prevesa, a spot full of memories, which he hoped to efface, of the inglorious dissolution of the last Christian League and the triumph of the Turk. Here, too, he faced the opening of the Gulf of Arta, the famous Ambracian gulf of ancient history, in which the fate of the Roman world was decided in that great sea-fight from which Antony and Cleopatra fled southward before the galleys of Octavius. On the morning of the 4th he anchored off Cape Blanco, the northern headland of Cephalonia. A bark, passing from the eastward, here brought him positive intelligence that the Turkish fleet was at Lepanto, and that Aluch Ali and his squadron had joined it. On the receipt of this welcome news, as the enemy could not be far off, and might be very near, Don John issued an order forbidding, under pain of death, a firearm to be discharged in any of the ships; and he and the Grand Commander, Requesens, each in a frigate, ran rapidly through the fleet. The same night he again set sail, but fogs and foul winds compelled him again to halt in the Canal of Cephalonia; and the greater part of the 5th he spent in the shelter of the harbour of Viscardo.’ (Vol. i. p. 400.)

The Viscardo channel divides the islands of Cephalonia and Ithaca. Down this passage the Christian fleet sailed in the night of October 6, arriving on the morning of Sunday, the 7th, at sunrise off the Curzolarian isles, a little to the north of the entrance to the Gulf of Patras. As the vessels rounded the northern shore of the great bay, the whole Turkish fleet was discovered to the east on the verge of the horizon.

‘Don John immediately ordered his foresail to be hauled to the wind, a square green ensign to be run up to the peak, a gun to be fired, and the sacred standard of the League to be displayed from the

maintop. At the report of the gun, the signal to prepare for battle, every eye in the fleet was turned towards the flagship. When the holy banner was seen waving in the breeze and gleaming in the morning sun, a cheer ran from ship to ship, and the crews of the whole fleet hailed the sign of the approaching combat with loud shouts of victory! . . . When the hostile fleets came in sight of each other, that of the League was, as we have seen, entering the Gulf near its northern shore, while that of the Turk was about fifteen miles within its jaws, his vast crescent-shaped line stretching almost from the broad swampy shallows which lie beneath the Acarnanian mountains to the margin of the rich lowlands of the Morea.

‘As the two armaments now advanced, each in full view of the other, the sea was somewhat high, and the wind, blowing freshly from the east, was in the teeth of the Christians. But in the course of the morning the waves of the Gulf fell to a glassy smoothness, and the breeze shifted to the west, a change fortunate for the sailors of the League, which their spiritual teachers did not fail to declare a special interposition of God in behalf of the fleet which carried the flag of His vicar upon earth.’ (Pp. 403, 404.)

‘As the two fleets approached—the Christians wafted gently onward by a light breeze, the Ottomans plying their oars to the uttermost—the Turkish commander, who, like Don John, sailed in the centre of his line, fired a gun. Don John acknowledged the challenge, and returned the salute. A second shot elicited a second reply. The two armaments had approached near enough to enable each to distinguish the individual vessels of the other, and to scan their various banners and insignia. The Turks advanced to battle, shouting and screaming, and making a great uproar with ineffectual musketry. The Christians preserved complete silence. At a certain signal a crucifix was raised aloft in every ship in the fleet. Don John of Austria, sheathed in complete armour, and standing in a conspicuous place on the prow of his ship, now knelt down to adore the sacred emblem, and to implore the blessing of God on the great enterprise which he was about to commence. Every man in the fleet followed his example, and fell upon his knees. The soldier, poising his firelock, knelt at his post by the bulwarks, the gunner knelt with his lighted match beside his gun. The decks gleamed with prostrate men in mail. In each galley, erect and conspicuous amongst the martial throng, stood a Franciscan or a Dominican friar, a Theatine or a Jesuit, in his brown or black robe, holding a crucifix in one hand and sprinkling holy water with the other, while he pronounced a general absolution, and promised indulgence in this life, or pardon in the next, to the steadfast warriors who should quit them like men, and fight the good fight of faith against the infidel.’ (Vol. i. pp. 407, 408.)

The Turkish commanders had been deceived as to the strength of the Holy League by the reports of the Greek fishermen and by an emissary of their own who had seen the fleet at Gomenitza. About the same hour that Don John weighed anchor at Cephalonia, the Turks left their moorings in

the harbour of Lepanto. The three hundred sail of the Sultan moved down the gulf in the form of an immense crescent, stretching nearly from shore to shore. Ali himself commanded in the centre, the Pasha of Alexandria on the right, and Aluch Ali—the redoubtable Algerine—on the left. It was not till the whole armada of the Christians slowly deployed round the rocky headlands on the north of the bay, that they learned the strength of the enemy they were to encounter, or felt misgivings as to the result of the action.

‘When the fleets neared each other, and the Christians were all prostrate before their crucifixes and friars, and no sound was heard on their decks but the voices of the holy fathers, the Turks were indulging in every kind of noise which Nature or art had furnished them with the means of producing. Shouting and screaming, they bade the Christians come on “like drowned hens,” and be slaughtered; they danced, and stamped, and clanged their arms; they blew trumpets, clashed cymbals, and fired volleys of useless musketry. When the Christians had ended their devotions and stood to their guns, or in their ordered ranks, each galley, in the long array, seemed on fire, as the noontide sun blazed on helmet and corselet, and pointed blades and pikes, with flame. The bugles now sounded a charge, and the bands of each vessel began to play. Before Don John retired from the fore-castle to his proper place on the quarter-deck, it is said, by one of the officers who has written an account of the battle, that he and two of his gentlemen, “inspired with youthful ardour, danced a galliard on “the gun-platform to the music of the fifes.” The Turkish line, to the glitter of arms, added yet more splendour of colour from the brilliant and variegated garb of the janissaries, their tall and fanciful crests and prodigious plumes, and from the multitude of flags and streamers which every galley displayed from every available point and peak. Long before the enemy were within range the Turkish cannon opened. The first shot that took effect carried off the point of the pennant of Don Juan de Cardona, who in his swiftest vessel was hovering along the line, correcting trifling defects of position and order, like a sergeant drilling recruits. About noon a flash was seen to proceed from one of the galleasses of the Christian fleet. The shot was aimed at the flagship of the Pasha, conspicuous in the centre of the line, and carrying the sacred green standard of the Prophet. Passing through the rigging of the vessel, the ball carried off a portion of the highest of the three splendid lanterns which hung on the lofty stern as symbols of command. The Pasha, from his quarter-deck, looked up on hearing the crash, and, perceiving the ominous mischief, said: “God grant we may be able to give a good answer to this question.” (Vol. i. pp. 410, 411.)

The action speedily assumed the fierce character of a personal combat.

‘Ali and Don John had each directed his helmsman to steer for the flagship of the enemy. The two galleys soon met, striking each other

with great force. The lofty prow of the Pasha towered high above the lower forecastle of Don John, and his galley's peak was thrust through the rigging of the other vessel until its point was over the fourth rowing-bench. Thus linked together the two flagships became a battlefield which was strongly contested for about two hours. The Pasha had on board four hundred picked janissaries—three hundred armed with the arquebus, and one hundred with the bow. Two galliots and ten galleys, all filled with janissaries, lay close astern, the galliots being connected with the Pasha's vessel by ladders, up which reinforcements immediately came when wanted. The galley of Pertau Pasha fought alongside. Don John's force consisted of three hundred arquebusiers; but his forecastle artillery was, for the reasons above mentioned, more efficient, while his bulwarks, like those of the other Christian vessels, were protected from boarders by nettings and other devices with which the Turks had not provided themselves. Requesens, wary and watchful, lay astern with two galleys, from which he led fresh troops into the flagship from time to time. Alongside, Veniero and Colonna were each hotly engaged with an antagonist. The combat between the two chiefs was on the whole not unequal, and it was fought with great gallantry on both sides. From the Turkish forecastle the arquebusiers at first severely galled the Christians. Don Lope de Figneroa, who commanded on the prow of the flagship, lost so many of his men that he was compelled to ask for assistance. Don Bernardino de Cardenas, who led a party to his aid, was struck on the chest by a spent ball from an *esmeril*, and in falling backwards received injuries from which he soon expired. Considerable execution was also done by the Turkish arrows, with which portions of the masts and spars bristled. Several of these missiles came from the bow of the Pasha himself, who was probably the last commander-in-chief who ever drew a bowstring in European battle. But, on the whole, the fire of the Christians was greatly superior to that of the Turks. Twice the deck of Ali was swept clear of defenders, and twice the Spaniards rushed on board and advanced as far as the mainmast. At that point they were on each occasion driven back by the janissaries, who, though led by Ali in person, do not appear to have made good a footing on the deck of Don John. A third attempt was more successful. Not only did the Spaniards pass the mast, but they approached the poop, and assailed it with a vigorous fire. The Pasha led on his janissaries to meet them, but it seems with small hope of making a successful resistance, for at the same moment he threw into the sea a small box, which was supposed to contain his most precious jewels. A ball from an arquebus soon afterwards struck him in the forehead. He fell forward upon the gangway (*crucija*). A soldier from Malaga, seizing the body, cut off the head and carried it to Don John, who was already on board the Turkish vessel, leading a fresh body of men to the support of their comrades. The trophy was then raised on the point of a lance, to be seen by friend and foe. The Turks paused for a moment panic-stricken; the Christians shouted victory, and, hauling down the Turkish standard, hoisted a flag with a cross in its place.' (Vol. i. pp. 413–415.)

This catastrophe, followed by the capture of the Turkish

admiral's ship, decided the fate of the battle. Meanwhile the Venetian and Roman galleys on the right were fighting with equal spirit and success. Old Veniero fairly won his doge's cap on the quarter-deck of his vessel; a Contarini, a Lore-dano, a Malipieri, conquered or perished in the fray; from the flagship of Genoa the young Prince of Parma leaped almost alone into a Turkish galley, and took the ship without a wound; in the flagship of Savoy the Prince of Urbino greatly distinguished himself. Never did the maritime genius and valour of Italy shine with greater lustre; and when we look back to the achievements of those days, we may indulge a hope that the naval power of Italy has not passed away for ever, and that, in the noble array of modern ships of war which she has created in our own times, men will not be wanting to emulate the deeds of their ancestors.

One other incident in the battle is too remarkable to be passed over in silence, for it relates to a masterly effort of seamanship, anticipating by centuries the celebrated manœuvre of breaking the enemy's line:—

'The right wing of the Christians and the Turkish left wing did not engage each other until some time after the other divisions were in deadly conflict. Doria and Aluch Ali were, each of them, bent on out-manœuvring the other. The Algerine did not succeed, like Sirocco, in insinuating himself between his adversary and the shore. But the seaman whose skill and daring were the admiration of the Mediterranean was not easily baffled. Finding himself foiled in his first attempt, he slackened his course, and, threatening sometimes one vessel and sometimes another, drew the Genoese eastward, until the inferior speed of some of the galleys had caused an opening at the northern end of the Christian line. Upon this opening the crafty corsair immediately bore down with all the speed of his oars, and passed through it with most of his galleys. This evolution placed him in the rear of the whole Christian line of battle. On the extreme right of the centre division sailed Prior Giustiniani, the commodore of the small Maltese squadron. This officer had hitherto fought with no less success than skill, and had already captured four Turkish galleys. The Viceroy of Algiers had, the year before, captured three galleys of Malta, and was fond of boasting of being the peculiar scourge and terror of the Order of St. John. The well-known white cross banner, rising over the smoke of battle, soon attracted his eye, and was marked for his prey. Wheeling round, like a hawk, he bore down from behind upon the unhappy Prior. The three war-worn vessels of St. John were no match for seven stout Algerines which had not yet fired a shot. The knights and their men defended themselves with a valour worthy of their heroic Order. A youth named Bernardino de Heredia, son of the Count of Fuentes, signally distinguished himself; and a Zaragozan knight, Geronimo Ramirez, although riddled with arrows like another St. Sebastian, fought with such desperation that none of the Algerine

boarders cared to approach him until they saw that he was dead. A knight of Burgundy leaped alone into one of the enemy's galleys, killed four Turks, and defended himself until overpowered by numbers. On board the Prior's vessel, when he was taken, he himself, pierced with five arrow-wounds, was the sole survivor, except two knights, a Spaniard, and a Sicilian, who, being senseless from their wounds, were considered as dead. Having secured the banner of St. John, Aluch Ali took the Prior's ship in tow, and was making the best of his way out of a battle which his skilful eye soon discovered to be irretrievably lost. He had not, however, sailed far when he was in turn descried by the Marquess of Santa Cruz, who, with his squadron of reserve, was moving about redressing the wrongs of Christian fortune. Aluch Ali had no mind for the fate of Giustiniani, and resolved to content himself with the banner of Malta. Cutting his prize adrift, he plied his oars and escaped, leaving the Prior, grievously wounded, to the care of his friends, and once more master not only of his ship, but of three hundred dead enemies who cumbered the deck, a few living Algerine mariners who were to navigate the vessel, and some Turkish soldiers, from whom he had just purchased his life.' (Vol. i. pp. 417, 418.)

It is impossible within our limits to convey to the reader the spirit with which Sir William Stirling Maxwell describes this famous battle. He has drawn from numberless sources, most of them buried in Spanish and Italian libraries, an infinite number and variety of details which throw a vivid lustre on the heroism and the chivalry of either combatant; and it would be difficult to find in history a more brilliant and exciting passage than these pages of his narrative. But we must borrow his concluding remarks:—

'The victory of the Christians at Lepanto was in a great measure to be ascribed to the admirable tactics of their chief. The shock of the Turkish onset was effectually broken by the dexterous disposition made of the galleasses of Venice. Indeed, had the great ships been there to strengthen the sparse line formed by these six vessels, it is not impossible that the Turks would have failed in forcing their way through the wall of that terrible fire. Each Christian vessel, by the retrenchment of its peak, enjoyed an advantage over its antagonist in the freer play of its artillery. When, however, the galleys of Selim came to close combat with the galleys of the League, the battle became a series of isolated struggles which depended more upon individual mind and manhood than upon any comprehensive plan or far-seeing calculation. But Don John of Austria had the merit or the good fortune of bringing his forces into action in the highest moral and material perfection; of placing admirable means in the hands of men whose spirit was in the right temper to use them. He struck his great blow at the happy moment when great dangers are cheerfully confronted and great things easily accomplished.

'His plan of battle was on the whole admirably executed. The

galleys of the various confederates were so studiously intermingled that each vessel was incited to do its utmost by the spur of rivalry. Veniero and Colonna deserve their full share of the credit of the day; and the gallant Santa Cruz, although at first stationed in the rear, soon found and employed his opportunity of earning his share of laurels. On Doria alone Roman and Venetian critics, and indeed public opinion, pronounced a less favourable verdict. His shoreward movement unquestionably had the effect of enabling Aluch Ali to cut the Christian line and fall with damaging force upon its rear, and of rendering the victory more costly in blood and less rich in prizes.' (Vol. i. pp. 420, 421.)

Amongst those who fought on board Doria's vessels, there was one whose fame is of another and more lasting kind, and whose striking features start with singular power from these graphic pages in an admirable illustration from an old print.

'These were the bold deeds of brave men, whose names are either forgotten or are pronounced without emotion or interest. But on board the "Marquesa" of Doria there was a military volunteer whose name is still familiar and delightful to thousands to whom Doria and Colonna are but strange sounds, and whose valour at Lepanto is a minor trophy of one whose achievements were to be accomplished by a better weapon than the sword. In that galley sailed Miguel de Cervantes, then in his twenty-fourth year. On the morning of the battle he lay sick of a fever. Nevertheless, he rose from his bed and sought and obtained the command of twelve soldiers posted near the long-boat (*esquife*), a position exposed to the hottest of the enemies' fire. He remained there until the combat was over, although he had received two wounds. One of these left him marked with an honourable distinction, the only military distinction ever conferred upon him, the loss of "the movement of his left hand for the honour of the "right." ' (Vol. i. p. 423.)

So ended the battle of Lepanto, and so ended, as it was supposed, the preponderance of the naval power of the Moslem, which had for ages harassed and terrified the coasts of the Mediterranean from Gibraltar to Cyprus. The sequel proved, however, that the Turks had still the power to send to sea another powerful naval armament. Indeed, the Bishop of Acqs wrote to Charles IX. from Venice immediately after the battle: 'Le grand Seigneur, avecque les riches trésors
' qu'il a et la commodité du long temps qui lui servira d'ici au
' mois de may, pourra remettre sus une bonne armée et néant-
' moins en dresser une par terre, de la grandeur de laquelle on
' ne doute point: *car il n'y a rien de gasté de ce costé-là.*' *

'Towards evening the milky sea and bright sunshine became troubled

* Charrière, 'Négociations du Levant,' vol. iii. p. 206.

and overcast. Don John therefore collected his forces and prepared to take shelter in the haven of Petala, near the north-western limit of the Gulf. Of the captured galleys, he set fire to those which were in a sinking condition; and the 'Florenzia,' a Papal vessel, being reduced to a mere wreck, was also burned. At sunset the field of battle presented a remarkable scene of desolation. For miles around the victorious fleet the waves, as eye-witnesses asserted, were reddened with blood, and were strewn with broken planks, masts, spars, and oars, with men's bodies and limbs, with shields, weapons, turbans, chests, barrels, and cabin furniture, the rich scarf of the knight, the splendid robe of the pasha, the mighty plume of the janissary, the sordid rags of the slave, and all the various spoils of war. Boats moved hither and thither amongst the floating relics, saving all that seemed valuable except the lives of the vanquished; for if a wounded Turk uttered a feeble cry for help or pity, he was answered by a shot from a musket or a thrust with a pike. As night closed over this heaving waste of carnage, the burning ships here and there revealed themselves to view, and cast a lurid glare across the waters, as they sent their wreaths of smoke and tongues of flame into the stormy sky.' (vol. i. p. 427.)

It has been said that the political results of this great battle were less important than they might have been; that the Christian armada might have attacked Lepanto* or Cyprus with success, or even sailed to the Golden Horn. But the moral effect of the Turkish defeat was great in Europe, and the chief purpose of the Holy League was accomplished. The allied forces could hardly have been brought to agree on ulterior operations of war. The season was far advanced; and towards the end of October Don John received the peremptory orders of the king to return to Meesina. On the last day of that month he stood once more into the Sicilian harbour.

The intelligence of the battle was received by Philip on the last day of October, through the Venetian ambassador, a month before the arrival of Don John's report. The king was at vespers in the chapel of 'that wilderness of gray walls and scaffold-shrouded towers which was rising on the bleak slopes of the Guadarrama;' but, says the Monk of the Escorial, 'the magnanimous prince neither changed his posture nor showed any emotion, it being a great privilege

* In the singularly modest despatch of October 10, with which Don John sends his report of the action to Philip II., he expresses his desire 'to follow up the good fortune which God has given us, and to see whether Lepanto can be taken, and if not, what other enterprise can be attempted:' it was therefore from no want of activity on his part that nothing more was done by the fleet.

‘ amongst others of the House of Austria never to lose, happen what may, their serenity of countenance and imperial gravity of demeanour.’ Vespers being over, a *Te Deum* was sung.

In Venice, in Rome, and in Seville, the news of the victory was hailed with frantic exultation. Ninety-nine Venetian versifiers extolled ‘ Del Carlo Quinto il generoso figlio.’ Nor were the Castilian muses silent. Ercilla devoted to it a canto of the ‘ *Arcauna*,’ and the popular ballad of Lepanto is still sung in the streets of Seville. Last in the long catalogue of poets who have sung of Lepanto is our own James VI. of Scotland, who composed a doggerel narrative of the battle as one of ‘ his Majesties poetical exercises at vacant hours,’ when he was about twelve or thirteen. It was printed in 1591, and translated into French by Du Bartas.

The artists of Italy paid a worthier tribute to the conquerors. Tintoretto, Vicentino, and the son of Tintoretto adorned the stately palaces and churches of Venice with pictures of the battle; and even Titian, then ninety-four years old, resumed his palette to produce a work still existing in the Royal Gallery of Madrid. In Rome a fresco of the battle was painted on the vault of the Colonna Palace, and a marble statue of Mare Antonio Colonna was placed in the Capitol. The city of Messina erected a colossal statue of Don John by Andrea Calamesto, which still stands grasping the triple truncheon of the Holy League, and is one of the noblest monuments of the sixteenth century.

To Don John himself congratulations, gifts, and honours flowed in from every side. Even the chilling style of Philip rose to unwonted cordiality in reply to his brother, and the language addressed to him by the minor States of Italy was extravagant. Don John received these honours with becoming modesty, but his early fame and amazing success had already raised in his imagination the phantom which was to be the unsatisfied torment of his life. He was haunted by the dream of a crown. Already, indeed, some emissaries of the Christian population of Albania and the Morea tendered to him the sovereignty of what is now the kingdom of Greece. The offer was reported to Philip, who replied that his close alliance with Venice rendered it unacceptable, but that the negotiations should be kept open.

Meanwhile the Holy League was still in existence, and its objects were by no means fulfilled. Selim, exasperated to fury by the defeat of his fleet, had lost no time in the armament of fresh galleys, and Aluch Ali, the Algerine, who had escaped from Lepanto, was placed at the head of the navy. Mahomet

Sokolli, the politic Grand Vizier, boasted to Barbaro that in defeating the Turkish fleet, the allies had 'only shaved our beard—a shorn beard grows all the better for the razor.' The winter was spent on both sides in negotiations and in preparations for the next campaign. But on May 1, 1572, the death of Pope Pius V. dealt a heavy blow to the alliance which owed its existence to his energy. He was in truth the last of the Crusaders, and Sir William Stirling Maxwell, with a characteristic mixture of admiration and sarcasm, drops this sentence at his tomb:—

'So died a man of as noble a nature as was ever perverted and debased by superstition. His honesty, his unselfishness, and his courage, were the means by which he rose to eminence amongst men who respected, if they rarely possessed, these qualities. Whatever the Church taught he was prepared to do, at whatever cost to himself or others; and in this spirit he accepted the bloody policy of Hebrew priesthood as a fitting rule for the chief teacher of a religion of love and peace. Had he lived in times when even theologians shrink from the practical application of their cruel dogmas and audacious theories, his conscience would probably have revolted from theories and dogmas which cannot bear the test of practice. The Romans esteemed the stern old man whose indomitable spirit had raised Europe against the infidel, and who had ruled over them with decency and honesty rare at the Vatican. They flocked in great crowds to gaze on his corpse, which they would have divided amongst them for relics had not a strong railing been interposed between the bier and their enthusiasm. And if they felt, in this case they restrained, their natural impulse to tear in pieces the friends and favourites of a dead pope.' (Vol. i. pp. 475, 476.)

The campaign of the allies in the summer of 1572 offers but little interest in comparison with the heroic exploits of the preceding year. The Pope was dead; the Spanish forces were delayed by the reluctance of the king to engage in any further enterprise which might aggrandise or benefit Venice; Don John chafed in vain in the harbour of Messina; and the Venetians were secretly negotiating a separate peace. The Turks meanwhile had shown greater promptitude and activity. Aluch Ali hovered on the coast of the Morea with a fleet of one hundred and seventy galleys. But the vessels were mostly new and built of green timber; the seamen were all raw recruits; few of the oarsmen had ever handled an oar; and the soldiers, still trembling at the terrible recollections or tales of Lepanto, had to be driven on board with the stick.

Don John at length put to sea, early in September, with an armament of one hundred and ninety-four galleys, forty large sailing ships, and eight galleasses. The Turk, warned by the lesson of last year, was in no condition to encounter such a

force at sea, and therefore fell back on the harbours of the Morea. The passage is remarkable because these same harbours of Modon and Navarino have in the present century witnessed similar operations, and a far more destructive attack upon a Turkish fleet. Don John attempted to cut off the Turkish vessels behind the island of Sapienza, but this movement having failed, Aluch Ali withdrew to the strongly fortified harbour of Modon, whilst the fleet of the League sailed into the bay of Navarino—famous in the world's annals since the wars of Troy, the Peloponnesian war, and the action of that modern League of Three Great Powers which gave independence to Greece. Here Don John virtually blockaded the Turkish fleet; but he could do no more. Time passed; the supplies of the Spaniards were exhausted; disputes arose between the commanders; and the campaign ended in a drawn battle. It had been conducted throughout with a singular want of strategical purpose and ability.

Again the winter was spent in ostensible preparations for war; but whilst Venice was raising troops, and completing the row-gangs of her fleet, her diplomacy, aided by that of France, was in fact dissolving the very bond of the League. The King of France had always been hostile to the League, and the Court of France alone of the Powers of Europe treated the Porte with what is now called a 'benevolent neutrality.' Charles IX. thought he had more to fear from Spain than from the Moslem. Accordingly, the Bishop of Aeqs, a Noailles by birth, had been sent to Constantinople to avert the conflict, and when that was impossible to endeavour to bring about peace. The details of his negotiation are extremely curious, and in the end it was successful.* The bishop supported the peace party in the Divan; he won over the Grand Vizier to his views; and on March 7, 1573, peace was concluded between Venice and the Porte, on terms far less favourable to the victorious than to the defeated party. Venice was satisfied with the maritime defeat of her rival, and the peace remained unbroken for seventy years. It was more difficult to justify

* The despatches of the bishop are published in the '*Négociations du Levant*' by Charrière, and they throw a singular light on French diplomacy. Charles IX. was much more afraid of Spain than he was of the Turks, and as France had then no navy he looked to the Turkish fleets to maintain the balance of power in the Mediterranean. He therefore thwarted the Holy League to the utmost of his power, and it was the object of France to detach Venice from her Christian confederates, and by embarrassing Spain to gain a footing for his brother Anjou in Flanders.

the perfidious conduct of the Republic to her allies, for by the terms of the League each member of the confederation had renounced the right of treating separately with the Turk.

‘It is certain that Venice with one hand signed a treaty of peace with the Turk and with the other an engagement to prosecute the war against him. On March 7 the Venetian envoy to the Sultan affixed his seal to the preliminaries of a treaty at Constantinople; and on the same day the Venetian envoy to the Pope swore, in presence of the pontiff, to observe the military convention at Rome. To this conduct Spanish historians apply the harshest language. In their eyes it is a new instance of old perfidy; a treacherous desertion of generous allies who had sacrificed their own interests to those of Venice; an act of sordid calculation by which a mercantile nation weighed glory against gain. Judged by a high standard of morality, the conduct of Venice is, of course, indefensible. But judged by the loose code which regulated international transactions in the sixteenth century, and which had always regulated Papal and Spanish policy towards the Republic, and with due regard to the previous proceedings and respective positions of the confederates, her conduct does not seem deserving of any very severe reprobation.

‘It is, however, more easy to excuse that policy than to explain it. If the Turks had rewarded Venice for leaving the league by granting her peace on advantageous terms, there would have been an obvious temptation to incur the displeasure and future coldness of her allies. But the terms being so hard it is strange that she did not endeavour to allay the indignation of the confederates by giving them early information of the step which she felt herself compelled to take. It may be that her minister hoped to the last to obtain peace on better conditions; or it may be that diplomacy has a natural tendency to work underground and prefer darkness to light.’ (Vol. i. pp. 510, 511.)

The Christian League was now at an end. Aluch Ali signalled the good news by burning the King of Spain’s tower of Castro on the coast of Apulia.

The second volume of this great work opens with two episodes in the life of Don John to which we can only make a passing reference, although they are not devoid of interest at the present day. After the dissolution of the Holy League, Philip determined to direct his naval forces against what has in modern times been called the Regency of Tunis. The occupation of that African province, then rich in resources and in trade, had long been held to be essential to the maritime power of the House of Austria, and the security of Sicily and Naples. Charles V., in person, had taken the Goletta in 1535, and that harbour had ever since been held by a Spanish garrison. The Moorish princes of Tunis lived in fact under a Spanish protectorate. To support them against the pretensions of the Porte was the object of Don John’s expedition. The

conquest of the town was an easy one, for the Turkish soldiers ran away, and a second fortress, garrisoned chiefly by Italians, was constructed on the western border of the Lake of Tunis, so as to command the channel from the Goletta to the sea. These details are a curious anticipation of the French occupation of Tunis in recent times. But if Don John's conquest was easy it was not lasting. In the following year the Turks, under Aluch Ali, took their revenge for Lepanto by sweeping down the Mediterranean. Tunis was besieged, and the forts taken. Don John was compelled by the precise orders of his brother not to sail in person against the enemy. The Viceroy of Naples refused supplies, and the whole incident ended in an ignominious defeat of the Spanish arms, although at one moment the Pope had suggested to Philip that Tunis might be erected into a sovereign state, and the crown awarded to Don John. The advice of Gregory XIII. was on this occasion met by one of those decorous rebuffs which practice had rendered the first temporal prince in Italy very expert in giving to his spiritual father. The pontiff was assured that he need not concern himself lest Don John's services should go unrewarded, his aggrandisement lying very near the king's heart.

It was not to the African coast, but to Italy and to Flanders, that the attention of the Spanish king was mainly directed, and that the ambition of Don John of Austria turned. About this time the romantic hope that he might deliver Mary Queen of Scots from captivity, and claim her hand as the reward of that knightly exploit, entered his mind, and appears never to have been entirely abandoned. But for the present the king's service demanded his presence in Italy, where he remained from April 1574 till the spring of 1576, residing chiefly at Vigevano, and occupied with the affairs of Genoa.

The constitution and the numerous revolutions of the Genoese Republic are far less known to the world than the history of the sister republic of Venice. • The struggle between the portico of St. Peter and the portico of St. Luke, in which the Dorias played so great a part, are unfamiliar topics; but they are instructive, and Sir William Stirling Maxwell has devoted a highly original and interesting chapter to these contentions, in which Don John was called upon to interpose the influence of the Spanish crown. We must pass on to greater events.

It is needless to follow Sir William Stirling Maxwell through his masterly historical sketch of the rising in the Netherlands. The story is one of inexhaustible interest, and few passages in the politics of modern Europe have been more closely inves-

tigated; for the cause of the Netherlands in the sixteenth century was the dawn of toleration and constitutional freedom. But we must confine ourselves strictly to the part in this great contest which fell to the lot of Don John of Austria. The viceroyalty of the Netherlands had been held for eight stormy and disastrous years (1559–1567) by Margaret, Duchess of Parma, who was also an illegitimate descendant of the great emperor. She was followed by the stern and sanguinary rule of Alba, who was again succeeded by Requesens, the representative of a more moderate policy. Requesens died on January 5, 1576, and Philip, roused for once into action by the urgency of the case, instantly appointed Don John to the office. The government of the Netherlands seemed likely to place Don John at the head of a force, and in a position, to enable him to realise the Pope's splendid dream of a conquest of England, deliver Mary, and set her and himself on the throne of Elizabeth, and restore the British kingdom to the bosom of the Church. But, in spite of these visionary splendours, and the pressing commands of the king, Don John (who was then in Lombardy) allowed twenty-four days to elapse before he acknowledged the appointment. On May 27 he wrote to Philip pointing out the extreme difficulty of the task, and indicating his own views of the policy which ought to be adopted in the following remarkable terms: --

‘All ordinances,’ he wrote, ‘contrary to the laws and customs of the Provinces, which have been issued by late governors, and which give so much offence, ought to be annulled.

‘All possible means of bringing back to the royal service the vassals of your Majesty, who may repent of their faults, should be adopted.

‘In appointing to places of trust, and in the general administration, the ancient customs of the country ought to be observed.

‘No person should be attached to my service who can give offence, and no foreign lawyers, who are so unpopular, should be employed.

‘As affairs are to be conducted without the employment of force, and solely by the authority of your Majesty and myself, I must have a household well appointed and respectable, and composed of persons of all nations.

‘To meet the unavoidable expense of even such an establishment as I have at present, I can assure your Majesty that neither the ordinary allowance nor the extraordinary subvention is sufficient, and that I am in debt to the amount of several thousand ducats. As I have no means of meeting these liabilities, I must entreat your Majesty, in this as in all things else, to supply my needs, with due regard to the part which your Majesty desires that I should sustain in the world.

‘One of the things which will most contribute to the success of my mission is that I should be held in high esteem at home, and that all men should know and believe that your Majesty, being unable

to go in person to the Low Countries, has invested me with all the powers I could desire. Your Majesty will see that I will use them for the re-establishment of your authority, now so fallen, in its due place. And if my conduct shall not satisfy your Majesty, you can resume these powers without fear of murmur on my part, or of opposition founded on my private interests.

‘The true remedy for the evil condition of the Netherlands, in the judgment of all men, is that England should be in the power of a person devoted and well-affectioned to your Majesty’s service; and it is the general opinion that the ruin of these countries, and the impossibility of preserving them to your Majesty’s crown, will result from the contrary position of English affairs. At Rome and elsewhere the rumour prevails that in this belief your Majesty and his Holiness have thought of me as the best instrument you could choose for the execution of your designs, offended as you both are by the evil proceedings of the Queen of England, and by the wrongs which she has done to the Queen of Scotland, especially in sustaining, against her will, heresy in that kingdom. Although neither for that nor for aught else do I believe myself to be fitted except in so far as it is your Majesty’s pleasure; yet, as in the world’s opinion that task is incumbent on me, and as your Majesty, ever ready to show your kindness to me, lends a willing ear to the project, and gives such evident marks of your desire that it should succeed, I cannot but long to kiss your hands for this favour; for although I esteem it at its just value, my own sentiments considered, it is of still greater value in my eyes, because it is conformable with my fixed purpose to desire nothing from your crown, even should your Majesty offer it, beyond that which as your creature I can and ought to have, and beyond those things which by your grace and favour, when your arms are at liberty, may dispose me to manifest my zeal for your service and aggrandisement. That this zeal cannot be greater either in vassal, servant, or son, I hope your Majesty will believe; and I hope God will grant me His grace to make it good.’ (Vol. ii. pp. 118-120.)

In spite of the king’s commands, he insisted on a personal interview, and landed at Barcelona on August 22. At the Escorial, Philip gave his brother a favourable reception.

‘Into the scheme for the invasion of England, and the marriage with Mary Stuart, Philip appears to have entered with real or affected warmth. In the feasibility of invasion, at one time at least, he had so firmly believed as to be disappointed with the Duke of Alba for not accomplishing it. In the marriage he foresaw an object which would turn all the energies of Don John into a channel by which his own interests in the Netherlands would be benefited. He therefore gave his full sanction and approbation to the gigantic plan of conquest and aggrandisement which had been laid down at Rome, subject to such conditions and instructions as might be sent after Don John to the Netherlands. . . .

‘The instructions began, it is true, with the injunction that England was not to be invaded until the Low Countries were pacified, and until

it was certain that no opposition would be offered by France. "You are to consider," said the king solemnly, "what a mistake it would be to leave our own dominions in danger, while we are trying to take possession of those of other people." The help that was to be had from the English Catholics was to be rigidly examined and weighed, "for no kingdom is so weak that it can be conquered without aid from within." Don John was to enter into the most amicable relations with Queen Elizabeth, to ascertain the exact amount and state of her naval and military resources, and to take every means of corrupting her ministers and favourites. "And as you are aware," pursued the royal writer, "of the nature of that queen, and how she usually gets into correspondence and relations with the persons whom she thinks she might perhaps marry, it may be that, by some roundabout way, she may entertain the same notions about you, and draw you into correspondence. If this should happen, you must not be by any means backward, but let her run on as she pleases, as it will afford a good occasion of furthering the design aforesaid." It had been agreed that the Spanish troops were to be withdrawn from the Netherlands; it must therefore be given out that they were going to Barbary, and with them the invasion of England must be effected. Victuals, munitions, and artillery must be provided in reasonable quantities, and also arms for the English Catholics. All these things must be done in profound secrecy. The objects of the enterprise were the restoration of England to the Church and of the Queen of Scots to her rights; but nothing was to be said about them at first, lest Mary should be put to death. When her liberty had been achieved she was to be placed at the head of the enterprise. It was to be considered what English seaport was to be chosen for disembarkation—Plymouth, Falmouth, Southampton, or Liverpool; and the one nearest to the prison of the Queen of Scots was to be preferred. Don John was not to lead the expedition until a landing had been effected and some success obtained. Julian Romero, Sancho de Avila, and Alonzo de Vargas, were all eligible for the command; but the king inclined to Romero, as being better acquainted with England and English affairs. It would be best to conduct the affair wholly in the name of Don John, as if it had been a sudden thought of his own, on which he had been led to act by the tempting opportunity afforded by the dismissal of the Spanish troops, and by his sympathy with the wrongs and sufferings of the Queen of Scots, the English Catholics, and the Church. The Pope's name was not to be put forward; but, if success were obtained, his Holiness might be asked to supply the necessary benediction, briefs, and a Nuncio, and to interpose if any of the Catholic powers sought to support Queen Elizabeth. The enterprise must be carried on in a spirit of "liberality, kindness, and forgiveness," and nothing must be said about rebellion or heresy to the Catholics or others who might join the Spanish standard. The instructions concluded in these characteristic words:—"The great brotherly love with which I regard and always have regarded you makes me desire the success of this affair, because I consider it, next to the service of God, the means it may afford me of showing how much I love you; in token whereof

“ I now assure you that, if all goes well with this enterprise of England,
“ it will please me to see you settled there and married to the Queen
“ of Scots—a marriage which I understand she desires, and which
“ indeed will be due to the man who shall deliver her from so great
“ misery, and set her free and in possession of her realms, even to one
“ whose quality and valour might not, as yours do, of themselves
“ deserve it. In case of success there will be some things to fix and
“ determine; but upon these it is not expedient to enter till the time
“ shall come. Meanwhile, it is sufficient to advise you that your settle-
“ ment in the aforesaid kingdom will have to be in such form and on
“ such conditions as shall appear to me expedient for my service and
“ for the good of our affairs and States.” These instructions, although
committed to writing, were, it seems, only read to Escovedo. But he
was furnished with a short note, in which Don John was told that the
bearer was charged with a verbal message from the king on a certain
business which he did not choose to enter upon on paper because of
the insecurity of the roads; and “you will hear and believe him,”
added the king, “as you would hear and believe myself, seeing that
“ he is a person in whom all confidence may be placed.” (Vol. ii. pp.
123–128.)

It was the last time the brothers met. Four weeks later Don John mounted his horse, and crossed the Guadarramas to Abrojo, where he took leave of his beloved foster-mother. Here he assumed the disguise of a Moorish slave, and set out with one companion and three servants to ride across France. Not till October 30 did he reach Paris, and as he left it on the following day, we have small belief in the story that he attended a ball at the Louvre in disguise on that same night, and lost his heart to the gay young Queen of Navarre. He reached Luxembourg on November 3; almost at the same moment the fury of the Spaniards had broken out with unparalleled violence, and accomplished the hideous and abominable tragedy of massacre and pillage known as the sack of Antwerp.

‘The few days which preceded and followed the arrival of Don John at Luxemburg were the most eventful days of a year full of great events for the Netherlands. The latest information furnished to him in Spain, or even the still fresher news which he may have learned from Zuniga at Paris, could hardly have prepared him for the intelligence now brought by each succeeding courier. The day before he reached Luxemburg Antwerp had been lawlessly sacked by the Spanish soldiery, who had been for some months in open mutiny, and against whom even the Spanish authorities had thought it right to arm the inhabitants of the defenceless towns. Of the first commercial capital in the north a great part was a smoking ruin; and several other towns had shared a similar fate. Negotiations had long been going on between the two Protestant States of Holland and Zeland, which had

openly cast off the royal authority, and the other States in which the Catholic faith had still preserved a real or nominal obedience to the Crown. The Spanish Fury of Antwerp, as the massacre there was called, inspiring the whole country with rage and a thirst for vengeance, had given a conclusive impulse to the progress of these negotiations. The Pacification of Ghent, which was signed on the 8th of November, bound Catholic Brabant, Hainault, Flanders, Artois, Namur, and various important Catholic cities, to support Protestant Holland and Zeland in resistance to royal authority until the Spanish troops should be withdrawn, the States-General convoked, and the oppressive edicts of late administrations unconditionally rescinded by the Crown. To this treaty province after province declared its adhesion, until only two of them, Luxemburg and Limburg, remained aloof from the confederacy. The islands on the north-west, which had been reconquered from the rebellion under the government of Requesens, fell piecemeal into the hands of the patriots, and the gallant Mondragone, unsupported by his mutinous soldiery, was forced to surrender Zierick-Zee to the troops of Orange. 'These were the tidings which each post brought to the new Governor at Luxemburg.' (Vol. ii. pp. 188, 189.)

There is abundant evidence to show that Don John of Austria entered upon his arduous task in a spirit of conciliation, and that he was earnestly desirous to restore peace, to prevent the effusion of blood, and to recognise the rights of the Netherlanders, within the limits of his commission, which bound him to maintain the authority of the Crown and the faith of the Church. But the exasperation of the people of Flanders, both Catholic and Protestant, was now kindled beyond the reach of conciliation, and the entire history of his brief administration is a record of surrender, humiliation, and defeat. It seems, too, that the noble and chivalrous nature of Don John recoiled, more than was common in that age, from the use of artifice and deceit. Beneath him, behind him, before him, lay all the plots and intrigues of the sixteenth century; but he was too little of a politician to play that game with success, and he was directly opposed to an antagonist who combined, with all the resources of a profound statesman, the strength of popular power and of religious fervour.

William of Orange, it is curious to remark, had been brought up in the household of Charles V., who was very fond of him, and gave him, before he was twenty-one, the command of an army. It was upon the shoulder of Orange that the emperor leaned when he pronounced his abdication speech before the Estates at Brussels, and it was by the hand of Orange that he transmitted to his successor the insignia of the Imperial throne. Yet he had soon excited the distrust of Philip, by his leaning to the side of national right and constitutional freedom; and

his unbounded respect for the rights of conscience rendered him no fit servant of the Catholic king. The part he had played as the directing genius of the revolution in preceding years placed Orange at the summit of power and popularity at the moment of the arrival of Don John in Flanders. Perhaps it was jealousy of a power so alien and so adverse to his own; perhaps it was a genuine distrust of an Austrian prince (for after all Don John himself was by birth and parentage more a Fleming than a Spaniard), but certain it is that the Prince of Orange viewed him, and treated him from the first, as an irreconcilable enemy. His proffered concessions were solemnly rejected; his desire of peace was derided and denied. Too much blood had been shed, too many crimes had been committed, for any peace to be lasting between Orange and Spain. Don John paid the penalty of the acts of his predecessors, not unconscious of the fatal position in which they had placed himself.

The first step taken by Don John was to announce to the States-General at Brussels his arrival at Luxembourg, and to order the Spanish troops to cease from all acts of hostility. He was aware that he would not be permitted to enter upon his functions until he had agreed to certain conditions, and that in fact the government of the country resided in the States. They showed their power by refusing to allow the Viceroy even to enter Namur at the head of fifty horse, still less to come to Brussels. The conditions he was to accept had been framed by Orange, and they involved the withdrawal of the Spanish troops for ever from the country. Eventually these terms were embodied in the Perpetual Edict. 'Some of the conditions of this peace,' wrote Don John to Garcia de Toledo, 'must appear hard, and to me they seem very hard; but to serve religion and obedience, where this and States themselves seem lost, it has been necessary to bear with them, making account of everything as if happening by chance. For the rest we must trust to time, that which God gives us not being little.'

This settlement led to a reaction in favour of the prince who had yielded so much, and though he remained at Louvain, he enjoyed a brief gleam of popular favour. But no settlement could suit the plans of William of Orange.

Don John evidently did not understand either the character or the motives or the ends of William the Silent. If he had understood them he would himself have been an abler and a less honest man than he was. His experience of public affairs and the men who conducted them—Granvelle, Perez, and the king—was not likely to have given him a

very exalted idea of human nature. Selfishness, it was plain, was man's ruling principle, a principle sometimes too strong to be checked even by loyalty to Church and king, in which Don John had been religiously fostered and in which he steadfastly believed. Loyalty to the right of a community of obscure mariners and graziers, seriously pleaded by a great lord of almost royal blood as a reason for taking up arms against his sovereign, was a feeling which Don John's education and habits of thought and life must have rendered incomprehensible to a man of his intellectual calibre. When he came, therefore, to study the character and ends of Orange, he naturally and inevitably concluded that William's own interests, and those of his house, were the objects which really lay near his heart and guided his course; and that the true policy of Philip's representative was to make it plain to his great antagonist that these interests could be better served by submission than by continued opposition, by selling than by defending the people of Holland and Zeland. He was confirmed in this conclusion by the tactics of Orange in the matter of the Edict, which were as shifty and tortuous as any that could have been devised by Perez or practised by Granvelle. In Don John's opinion, Leoninus had not been instructed to use sufficient plainness of speech, William was too cautious to be more explicit; when the principals themselves came face to face, a bargain would nevertheless be struck, and meanwhile nothing remained but to warn the king that the aspect of affairs compelled liberality, and that the man who had thwarted him for twenty years was not going to sell himself cheap.

Orange, on his side, regarded Don John with the distrust with which he could not fail to regard any one sent to the Netherlands by Philip II. for the obvious purpose of trying fraud alone in the game where fraud and force had hitherto failed. He studied his character and policy in the letters which he occasionally contrived to intercept, and it would have been singular indeed if, on the governor's confidential communications with Spanish military officers in the Netherlands, or with statesmen in Spain, he did not find matter for increasing his suspicions. At first his distrust was mingled with a feeling of contempt, which was probably engendered by the want of self-command and of fixed purpose which Don John had displayed at Luxemburg and Huy. "The only difference," he wrote, "between this new governor and Alba or Requesens is that he is younger and more foolish, less capable of concealing his venom and more impatient to dip his hands in blood." This feeling of contempt does not appear to have been lasting. Orange was too wise to despise an antagonist whose power, shown as it was, was so considerable as that of the King of Spain's viceroy, and his constant advice to those who consulted him to beware of Don John, seemed to show an apprehension that that power was likely to be used with no inconsiderable skill. Nor did he ever relinquish his schemes for obtaining possession of Don John's person, although they were doomed to prove abortive.' (Vol. ii. p. 215.)

To the king Don John wrote fearlessly: 'In the Nether-

‘lands the name of your Majesty is as much abhorred and ‘despised as that of the Prince of Orange is loved and feared;’ and again: ‘I see no remedy to preserve the State from ‘destruction except by gaining over this man, who has so much ‘influence with the nation.’ That attempt was vanity itself. But the Viceroy had so far gained ground that in May 1577 he was allowed to make his public entry into Brussels. His stay there was exceedingly short, for he was apprised of plots to seize his person, and he retired shortly to Malines, and afterwards to Namur.

It is interesting to learn that about this time he received the visit of Sir Philip Sidney, then on his return from his mission to the Emperor Rudolph at Prague. Once then the model and the mirror of English and of Spanish highbreeding and chivalry met, and met on kindly terms; both destined to that early death which the gods grant to those who have fulfilled a course of glory. A month later came a visitor of a different race. Queen Margaret arrived at Namur on her way to Spa. She was received by the prince with great magnificence, and the ‘fair mischief,’ as Sir William terms her, passed on her way in a web of adventure and intrigue, destined to lead eventually to the French intervention in Flanders.

But whilst Don John was labouring to win the confidence of the people and disarm their leaders, against fearful odds, he had also to contend against the indifference, the suspicions, even the hostility of the Court of Spain. Antonio Perez, then chief secretary of Philip, had awakened the jealousy of the sovereign; attempts were made to entrap Don John in his correspondence; when Escovedo, his confidential secretary, was sent to Madrid to give explanations and to obtain reinforcements, he was forthwith assassinated by the direct orders of Philip and Perez; and the appeals of the hapless Governor of the Netherlands for money, for support, for counsel, for encouragement, were left unanswered. It was as if Philip, disgusted by his want of success, or alarmed by signs of independence and ambition, was content to leave him to perish. The visions of glory and ambition which had crowded around his earlier years were fast passing away; and disappointment and defeat marked the remaining months of his life.

Driven to extremity, and believing that his own life was threatened, Don John seized by a ruse the fortress of Namur, where, as the king’s representative, he had a very good right to command. An attempt, which failed, was made to obtain possession of Antwerp. Letters from Don John to the king were intercepted, which proved that he had lost all confidence

in the States. 'God knows,' he wrote, 'how much I desire to avoid extremities, but I know not what to do with men who show themselves so obstinately rebellious.' But he clearly foresaw the imminent necessity of exchanging the pen for the sword, and he earnestly prepared for the inevitable contest.

Whilst these events were occurring or in preparation, two underplots were carried on which bore a singular relation to the great contest between Orange and Don John of Austria. The ascendancy of Orange had awakened the fears of the Catholics in Southern Flanders and the jealousy of the great nobles. The rift which was soon to separate the Western Catholic provinces from the Dutch Protestant confederacy, and restore the former portion of the Netherlands to the dominion of Spain, became apparent, and by a strange device the young Archduke Matthias, brother to the Emperor Rudolph, was invited to place himself at the head of the Estates in Brussels. He accepted the invitation, escaped from Vienna, and arrived in the Low Countries. Orange was equal to the occasion; he saw that the lad might be made his tool, and used by himself against the Spaniards. He therefore received the archduke at Antwerp with all honour, and eventually placed him in a chair of state at Brussels. That was all that Matthias ever attained to; power he had none; but it was an artful addition to the perplexities of Don John that a representative of the German branch of the House of Austria, and his own cousin, should be played off against the authority of Philip II.

Nor was this all. Besides the Austrian archduke, a French claimant to the government of the Netherlands appeared in the person of the Duke of Anjou—the most contemptible member of an odious race—who in the intervals of his absurd courtship of Queen Elizabeth engaged in deep intrigues with the Flemish insurgents, to which Orange was also a party. The train had been laid by Queen Margaret of Navarre, who was passionately attached to her brother, when she paid her stately visit to Don John at Namur; the plot was encouraged by Catherine de Medicis, the queen's mother; and Anjou arrived at Mons at the head of levies raised from the royal troops of Henry III. Another enemy was in the field, and the breach widened between the royal houses of Spain and France. It is satisfactory to know that Queen Elizabeth emphatically condemned both the adventure of Matthias and the projected French alliance. She informed the Estates that if it were persisted in she would withdraw her friendship, and even take up arms against them.

Mr. Motley, in his history of the 'Rise of the Dutch Republic,' has devoted several chapters to the administration

of the Netherlands by Don John of Austria. Many of his statements are singularly inaccurate, and his whole work is animated by a fierce hatred of Don John, which breaks out in coarse invective. To Mr. Motley he is 'the double-dealing 'bastard of a double-dealing emperor;' frenzied with furious passion, irritable, sanguinary, and unjust. What in Orange is described as 'slight dissimulation' is denounced in Don John as 'odious deceit.' Mr. Motley is a very intemperate writer, whose views and expressions are not unfrequently coloured at the expense of truth. No one can read the more careful and dispassionate pages of Sir William Stirling Maxwell without forming a very different estimate of the character and position of Don John of Austria. It is impossible to doubt, on the evidence of these volumes, that the young governor of the Netherlands entered upon his arduous task with a sincere and honest desire to pacify the country by liberal concessions to the civil and religious rights of the people; that he deplored the severities of Alba and the atrocities of the Spanish troops, whom he soon agreed to send away altogether; and that he actually surrendered everything short of his own liberty and life (which were threatened), and the king's sovereignty, to the maintenance of peace. It was Orange who was resolved to make peace impossible. It was Orange who was intriguing with France and Austria, and who raised the terms of compromise (which had been accepted by both parties) until they became impossible. It was under the influence of Orange that, on December 7, 1577, the States-General declared that Don John was no longer stadtholder, governor, nor captain-general, but an infractor of the peace he had sworn to maintain, and an enemy of the fatherland. So much is acknowledged by Mr. Motley himself. 'To this point,' he says, 'had 'tended all the policy of Orange, faithful as ever to the 'proverb with which he had broken off the Breda conferences, 'that war was preferable to a doubtful peace.'* Orange may have been right from his point of view, though his policy led very shortly to great military disasters, and to the ultimate severance of the provinces. What he had in view was the Protestant cause and the independence of Holland. But he was resolved that Don John should not have fair play; that the system of conciliation should not be tried; and that every artifice should be employed to traduce and resist it. Don John himself was a man of a courteous, kindly, and liberal nature—not cruel, not unjust; his ambition was lofty, and he looked to

* Motley, vol. iii. p. 289.

the pacification of the Netherlands as the road to higher things. No doubt when he saw his efforts met by contumely and violence, he conceived a strong resentment against his enemies. But he seems to have shown an extraordinary amount of self-command under great provocation, and it was only in his secret despatches to Madrid, which were intercepted and made public, that he exhaled his bitter disappointment. The unanswerable defence of his policy and conduct appears to us to be that, although arms were his profession, although he was trained to war and excelled in it, although he had far more to fear from the national party in the closet than in the field, it was only as the very last resort, and when all other means were exhausted, that he engaged in hostilities. When that day came, and the commander, at the head of the king's troops, was able to meet his enemies, the result was not doubtful; they were dispersed like smoke on the field of Gemblours by the superiority of the Spanish arms. It is said that six or seven thousand of the Netherlands fell on that day, though the victory cost the Spaniards but a handful of men. Immediately the towns of Louvain, Tirlemont, Aerschot, Nivelles, and half a dozen more, submitted to the conqueror. The battle of Gemblours can hardly be said to add to the military fame of Don John, for it was won by the dash and prowess of his cousin, the Prince of Parma, who, at the head of six hundred troopers, forded a miry ravine, outflanked the enemy, and decided the victory. 'Tell Don John,' exclaimed the young hero, who was reconnoitring the position, 'that, like the ancient Roman, I am about to plunge into a gulf, and by the aid of God, and under the auspices of the House of Austria, to win a great and memorable victory.' Alexander Farnese kept his word. Such were the men and the forces which Don John refused till the last moment to use. War being declared, it was carried on with the sanguinary ferocity of the age. During the spring Elizabeth urged Don John to grant a 'susciance of arms,' and Mr. Fenton, the Queen's agent, made the following report on the position of the governor:—

'Don John remaineth in that part of Hainault that bordereth upon France, and commandeth sixteen walled towns. His whole camp containeth eighteen thousand men for the fight, viz. three thousand horsemen and the residue footmen. Of these he maketh special account of six thousand being Spaniards of the old hands; the residue are mercenaries of sundry nations and customs, and of resolution and valour doubtful. He lieth not encamped in any one place, but has disparted his companies into garrisons within the towns he hath won, by which impediment he is not able to put an army to the field, nor

advance any great exploit of war, having withal no store of great artilleries, field pieces, nor gunpowder. He expecteth a provision of these munitions from Luxemburg. He entertaineth great intelligence with certain particulars in the Council of the Estates, by whom gaining the factions he hath contracted with the Duke of Brunswick for four thousand *reitres* and two thousand lance-knights, who, as soon as they arrive, he meaneth to take the field and march, pretending to bestow in his towns the lance-knights and revoke to the camp his own companies. But I hear that by the Diet of Worms the Duke of Brunswick is forbidden to make any levies against the Estates. Such places as Don John taketh by composition he observeth justly his covenants with; every particular in the country where he commandeth lived in no less freedom and security than if there were no war at all. The husbandman under his protection laboureth the ground in safety, and bringing victuals to his camp he receiveth his money in quietness and returneth without fear of violence. He punisheth with death all sorts of pillage and insolvency, not sparing in that crime any nation or nature of soldiers, of what merit soever. By these humanities he maketh deep impression on the hearts of the people, and so changeth the course of the war that he beginneth to make less in the popular sort the hatred universally borne to the nature of the Spaniards. He is environed with a grave council, with whom he useth to counsel touching all expeditions and directions of the war. These are of his Privy Council: "the Prince of Parma, Ottavio Gonzaga (he governeth 'him most), Don Gabriel Nino, Doctor del Rio, Count Barlaymont, 'Count Charles of Mansfeldt, Don Lopus, Don P. de Taxis, Monsieur 'de Billi, and Mondragone. These in all their behaviour do wonderfully reverence him, and by their example he is honoured with a "wonderful obedience of the inferiors." (Vol. ii. p. 304.)

Yet at this very time Philip was intriguing against his brother: he secretly offered to the Estates to place the Prince of Parma or even the Archduke Matthias in his place; in March Escovedo was murdered; Don John himself would gladly have accepted any change; in his more sombre moments he was for retiring to some wild hermitage amongst the Sierras of Spain; his life was attempted by two assassins from England; and his health began to fail. In July another battle was fought at Rijnemants, with far less decisive results, for the Spanish troops were opposed, not to the burgher levies of the Netherlands, but to some of the French Huguenots under François de la Noue, and to a body of English troops commanded by Sir John Norris, reinforced by a Scotch detachment, who met the enemy by first singing a psalm and rushing to battle nearly naked. The victory was claimed by both sides, the action being, in fact, indecisive. This was the last appearance of Don John of Austria in the field. Sick in body and soul, anxious and yet hopeless, he

consented to re-open negotiations for peace, and to receive the envoys of the Estates. But the conditions dictated by Orange were impossible. They required that the governor, then at the head of a powerful army, should evacuate the country. Walsingham and Cobham, the English envoys, were with him when the proposals arrived. 'In conference with him,' Walsingham wrote to Lord Burghley on August 27, 'I might easily discern a great conflict in himself between honour and necessity. Surely I never saw a gentleman for personage, speech, wit, and entertainment comparable to him. If pride do not overthrow him, he is like to become a great personage.' As for the terms, Walsingham said to the Prince, 'They are too hard; but, bad as they seem, it is only by pure menace that we have extorted them from the Estates.' 'Then,' said Don John, 'you may tell them to keep their offers to themselves. Such terms will not do for me.' This is almost the last recorded utterance of the ill-starred prince whose life began in all the radiance of glory, and ended in all the gloom of defeat and despair. Ten years embrace the whole career of Don John of Austria, marked without intermission by the vicissitudes of fortune and of fame. But it was not the pride of empire that was to lay Don John of Austria low. A humbler and a sadder fate was at hand. After the rupture of the last negotiations Don John had withdrawn his army to an entrenched camp at Bouges, near Namur, a position which commanded a long reach of the river Meuse. It had been occupied by his father when hard pressed by the force of Henry II., and it was chosen for sanitary as well as strategical reasons, a pestilence having broken out amongst the troops in and around the town of Namur. Don John took up his quarters there towards the middle of September.

'He had been again attacked by the fever, which indeed had been for weeks lingering in his system. His last illness was reckoned by those about him to have commenced on September 17. He thought the change of air might do him good; and, besides, at the camp he was nearer his works and his daily duty. So great was his weakness that he was carried up the hill from Namur on a camp-bed borne on men's shoulders. His arrival, very unexpected, had not been prepared for. Refusing to allow any of the superior officers to be disturbed on his account, he desired to be carried to the quarters of the regiment of Figueroa, one of whose captains, Bernardino de Zuñiga, was attached to his household. Zuñiga had established himself in a ruined grange, and an old pigeon-house attached thereto was selected as the only apartment available for Don John. The place was hastily cleaned; its rough walls were clothed with some rich armorially

emblazoned hangings, and damask curtains were placed over the holes which served as windows. A wooden staircase was constructed in place of the ladder by means of which it had been formerly reached. In this forlorn loft he continued for some days to write despatches and transact the business of the army from his sick-bed. By a curious coincidence, on the same day when his disorder returned his old friend and comrade Serbellone, the engineer, was prostrated by a similar ailment. The attacks of the disease were in both cases intermittent, and recurring as it happened at coincident intervals of time. The engineer's fever appeared to be the more severe, and he was, besides, upwards of seventy, and broken with campaigning and captivity. The doctors thought ill of the old soldier's chances of recovery, but for the young general they did not at first feel any apprehension.

'During the intervals between his attacks Don John continued his usual correspondence. The letters written from Bouges give a very gloomy picture of his feelings and his life. In his mind diseased he suffered more than in his fevered frame. Hopes long deferred now seemed to his excited imagination utterly destroyed. He felt himself forsaken and betrayed by the king whom he had so ardently and unscrupulously served.

"His Majesty," thus he wrote to his friend Don Pedro de Mendoza, the Spanish agent at Genoa, on September 16, "his Majesty is resolved upon nothing; at least I am kept in ignorance of his intentions. Our life is doled out to us here by moments. I cry aloud, but it profits me little. Matters will soon be disposed, through over-negligence, exactly as the devil would most wish them. It is plain we are left here to pine away to our last breath. God direct us all as he may see fit; in his hands are all things." On the same day he wrote also to his old naval companion, Giovanni Andrea Doria, at Genoa. "I rejoice to see by your letter," he said, "that your life is flowing on with such calmness while the world around me is so tumultuously agitated. I consider you most fortunate that you are passing the remainder of your days for God and yourself; that you are not forced to put yourself perpetually in the scales of the world's events, nor to venture yourself daily in its hazardous game." Himself he described as surrounded with countless enemies, who were now pressing upon him within half a mile of the spot which he had selected for his final stand, and which he looked upon as his last refuge. Fighting a battle was for him out of question; he did not believe he could hold out for above three months; and he received no aid from the Government at home, who could not or would not see that in the loss of the present chance all would be lost. The Duke of Anjou was strengthening himself in Hainault, and in the background was the French king professing amity but preparing to invade Burgundy if fortune favoured his brother. "Again and again have I besought his Majesty," he added, "to send me his orders, which shall be executed if they do not come too late. They have cut off our hands; nothing now remains but to stretch forth our heads also to the axe. I grieve to trouble you with my sorrows, but I trust to your sympathy as a man and as a friend. I hope that you will remember me in your

“prayers, for you can put your trust where in former days I could never put mine.”

‘Four days later, on September 20, he wrote his last letter to the gloomy, obdurate, silent king. He informed him that he was confined to his chamber with fever, and that he was as much reduced as if he had been ill a month. “I assure your Majesty,” he said, “that the work here is enough to destroy any constitution and any life.” He had often warned the king that the French were busy in tampering with what remained of loyalty in the provinces. The success of these secret practices was now apparent, and Anjou at the head of an increasing force was fairly established in the country. The inhabitants were everywhere alarmed, and many disaffected. With his small and dwindling force it was impossible for him to hazard any important attack on the enemy, and even remaining stationary he could hardly hope long to keep open the communications by which alone money and supplies could reach him. The pest was consuming his army. He had twelve hundred men in hospital, besides those who were laid up in private houses; and he had neither means of meeting the emergency nor money to obtain them. The enemy, finding his operations in the field suspended, had cut off his waterway by the Meuse to Liege, and had advanced to Nivelles and Chimay, on the same stream. He would give his blood rather than annoy the king with such tidings, but he felt it to be his duty to tell the plain truth. He suggested that special envoys should be sent to Paris to remonstrate against the proceedings of Anjou, and to the Pope to ask for the duke’s excommunication. “Thus I remain,” he said, “perplexed and confused, desiring more than life some decision on your Majesty’s part, for which I have begged so many times.” “Orders for the conduct of affairs,” that was his first wish, and it wounded him to the soul to find them so long delayed. Was he to attack the enemy in Burgundy, or on some other side; or was he to remain where he was awaiting orders? And he was deeply pained at being disgraced and abandoned by the king, whom he had served as a man and a brother with all love and fidelity and heartiness. “Our lives are at issue on this stake,” he said, “and all we desire is to lose them with honour.”

‘When Philip received that pathetic letter, he drew his pen beneath the words entreating for “orders for the conduct of affairs,” and wrote on the margin, “The underlined question I will not answer.” When he made this cruel annotation it was already decreed that he was to be troubled no more with such passionate appeals. The hand which had penned the passage was cold in death.’ (Vol. ii. p. 330.)

From the commencement of his illness Don John despaired of his recovery. On September 28 he received the Holy Communion, and transferred to the Prince of Parma his civil and military authority. Alexander was by his side, and performed to the last all the offices of friendship and affection. He confessed himself devoutly, gave some parting directions to his confessor, and added, ‘And now, father, is it not just that I who have not a hand’s breadth of earth that I can call my

‘own in this world, should desire to be at large in heaven?’ After an interval of feverish delirium, on October 1 he was again calm and collected, and he heard mass. His last conscious act was that of adoration, but he continued murmuring the names of Jesus and Maria until about one in the afternoon, when he expired, ‘passing,’ as his confessor said, ‘out of our hands like a bird of the sky, with almost imperceptible motion.’ His remains were ultimately conveyed, though in a strange manner, to Spain, and interred in a sepulchral chamber of the Escorial, adjacent to the vault which contained the bones of Charles V.

Sir William Stirling Maxwell has not thought it necessary to review the character of the prince to whom he has devoted this splendid monograph. The interest he felt in it himself is best shown by the industry and ability with which he has recorded the events of his life. Don John of Austria was not a man of political genius or of rare intellectual power; he had not the imperial grasp of his father, or the subtlety of his brother, or the resources of his cousin and successor, Alexander Farnese. But he had in him, far more than these his kinsmen, something of an heroic fire. His own inspirations were brave and manly; if he failed it was as the instrument and the victim of a system of policy based on ‘the right of God’s anointed kings to misgovern their subjects.’ He passed through life in a treacherous and cruel age unstained by perfidy or crime; and he retained to the last unshaken fidelity to a sovereign little worthy of so brave and noble a kinsman. There are few princes or soldiers or courtiers of the sixteenth century of whom as much can be said.

The darkest hour precedes the dawn, and the moment at which Don John of Austria expired was that at which the cause of Spain appeared to be most hopeless. It might be a curious subject of historical enquiry how it came to pass that the Prince of Parma succeeded in re-establishing the authority of Spain over a considerable portion of the Low Countries, where his predecessor had egregiously failed. But within a few weeks of the death of Don John the horizon cleared, and events occurred which materially weakened the enemies of the Spanish crown. The Duke of Anjou, disappointed of the objects of his ambition, dissolved his forces. Ghent, the centre of the revolutionary party, broke out in anarchy and violence. Catholic and Protestant renewed their internecine feuds, and by these religious dissensions the union of the Provinces and Estates was broken up, never to be renewed. The Walloon provinces formed a separate treaty between themselves, and

entered into negotiations with Parma. Thenceforth it was with the united provinces of Holland alone, cemented by the compact of Utrecht, which was signed only three months after the death of Don John of Austria, that the contest was carried on. That no doubt was the foundation of the glorious Protestant commonwealth of the Netherlands, which for many a long year defended and at last won its independence. But the confederacy of the States which had opposed Don John was at an end, and the final separation of the Netherlands into their Catholic and Protestant elements was completed by the administration of Alexander Farnese and the death of Orange.

ART. II.—1. *A New History of the English Stage.* By PERCY FITZGERALD, M.A., F.S.A. Two volumes. London: 1882.

2. *Histoire Universelle du Théâtre.* Par ALPHONSE ROYER. Quatre tomes. Paris: 1869.

3. *Our Old Actors.* By HENRY BARTON BAKER. Two volumes. London: 1878.

4. *Mémoires de Samson de la Comédie Française.* Paris: 1882.

5. *Reports published by the Council of the Church and Stage Guild, London, 1880, 1881, and Papers read before the Guild by Rev. Stewart D. Headlam, Mrs. Stewart Headlam, Miss Ella Dietz, and others.*

6. *Hroswithæ Gandeshemensis Comædiæ Sex.* Edidit I. BEN-DIXEN. Lubeca: 1862.

THE drama in its early Greek cradle was not the amusement of leisure-seekers, but the festive business of the entire community. That spectacle 'knit up the ravell'd sleeve' of antagonism, and closed for a while the open seams of faction, in the feeling of civic brotherhood. The spectacular purpose, moreover, was a religious one, and every drama had a hymnic motive. Each individual of the nation or city, thus met to dedicate their common joy, renewed the pledge of mutual incorporation, which rallied again to unity the rivalries of litigation, politics, and commerce. Packed thus in time of peace into a single building at their great Dionysiac gatherings, the representative manhood of the State would abandon to the women and children, to the aliens and slaves, to the sick and impotent, the entire residue of the city's area. Thus the

stage became the crater at which a flood of sentiment, at once national and devotional, at once patriotic and artistic, found its vent. The muse of tragedy gazed from her mask on all orders of her native realm, gathered in solemn pageant as for a festive liturgy, an ovation of æstheticism heightened by an enthusiasm of religion which knew no sects to divide, no puritanism to estrange. The muse of comedy peeped forth upon a laughing throng, redolent of the wine-vat, eager for an orgy. The theatre became a temple for the time, whose votaries were the constituents at once of pnyx, dicasteries, agora, and senate; and as the volcano is the mountain, that seething vortex of exalted humanity was the State itself. There was the highest honour for the actor, the supreme triumph, the all but apotheosis, of the poet. Even criticism felt the nobility of its mission to applaud the worthiest, not to expose the feeblest; and the critic was present to gather honey and not to sting. So far from degrading attributes clothing the stage, the choregus and protagonist found in it a patent of nobility, and its humblest accessory became the acolyte of a cultured mystery, the trainbearer of 'gorgeous Tragedy in sceptred pall,' and basked in the halo of her splendour. To such a pile of human sympathies as the world had never seen before, including patriotic fervour, religious rapture, exuberant jocosity, and frolic ecstacy, the altar of Dionysus supplied the torch; and the whole of living Athens became a conflagration of enthusiasm with which no modern audience of playgoers, each anxious for his half-guinea's worth or half-crown's worth, can ever hope to compete.

The only state of public feeling comparable to it in later times was that of the vast concourses met in the fervour of faith to celebrate some mediæval Passion-mystery, whence crowds who came in singing would return in tears.* For the development of the modern European drama has its point of departure everywhere in the Church. In France, where the genius of the people most favoured the continuity and fulness of Latin influence, the play was at first a mere appendix to the sacred offices and hardly distinguishable from them. The name 'mystery' was given to each alike; the Church itself was the theatre, the altar serving in the oldest mystery, that of the Passion, for the Saviour's tomb. A church choir or a company of friars were the first performers. First, in the process of development, the dramatic part was

* 'Les foules y vont en chantant et en reviennent en pleurant.'—Royer, i. 214, citing a 'Breton proverb' as authority.

detached from the church office proper and played between mass and vespers. Then we hear of a scaffold erected in the chancel. In due course the scene migrates outside the church door, but is still in the sacred precinct. Lastly, municipal rivals arise to the religious fraternities which had had the monopoly before, and scaffoldings were erected in the towns. The French *Trouvères* of the thirteenth century not only dropped Latin and adopted the vulgar tongue, but, while retaining something of a religious tinge, drew plots from existing social relations. Thus we have in ‘Robin et Marion’ a shepherdess damsel carried off by a *seigneur* whom she resists ‘tooth and nail;’ her swain meanwhile keeping at a judicious distance from his long sword, but, when she has effected her escape, bragging of the feats he had intended. They found another source for their plots in the earlier *fabliaux*, which lent themselves easily to dramatic treatment. Here we find, then, on the one hand the germ of the comic opera, on the other that of the modern adaptation of the play from the novel. Germany runs a parallel course, but takes each stage somewhat later. It boasts, however, the dramatic ‘Dialogues’ of the nun Hroswitha, supposed to have been written by her at the age of twenty years in the Saxon convent of Gandersheim, about 950 A.D. There are six of these preserved, all teaching the lesson on which the elder brother dilates in Milton’s ‘Comus’—

‘ ’Tis chastity, my brother, chastity.’

The characters are wholly taken from the legends of saints, but the situations and speeches are worked up from the imagination of the writer. All are in Latin, marvellously pure for the period, without a trace of the base monastic idioms current among the ‘religious’ in the time of Otho the Great. Each piece is a single act, comprising sometimes as many as fourteen scenes. They have been sometimes spoken of as echoes of Terence, and it is possible that the currency of his works may have suggested their form; but their Latinity, although superior, is not Terentian.* M. Royer throws doubts on their antiquity, merely on the general ground that the turmoil and wild confusion of the age seems ill suited to literary repose and leisure. But there must have been intervals in the fits of havoc, or religious societies could hardly have existed at all; and in those intervals it was more easy to throw off the lighter work of the imagination than to carry on a prolonged strain of

* They are largely charged with the vulgate and patristic Latin; e.g. *mansiuncula*, *acceptabilis*, *insensatus*, *lucifluus*, *carnalis*, *sospitas*, *inremediabiliter*.

ponderous thought on serious subjects. The Germans, however, although they remained constant to the cycle of sacred subjects for a longer time, yet made early advances towards the partial disuse of Latin. A mixed language known as the *lingua farcita*, *langue farcie* (perhaps the origin of 'farce'), appears early in the eleventh century, and was an allowed medium of the representation of scriptural stories.

But down to the close of the twelfth there appears to be no certain trace of any dramatic piece wholly in the vernacular except in France. Even there, however, Latin,* or a similar transitional admixture of Latin and Provençal, is common throughout both these centuries, during which the dramas continue to be on sacred themes, occasionally including original combinations. Thus the parable of 'the Wise and Foolish Virgins' is introduced into a drama on the Resurrection. These Virgins visit the sepulchre and have the news of the Resurrection announced to them; on which the foolish, but the foolish only, go to sleep and spill their oil. In due course their alarm and rejection follow, much as in the parable. The manuscript of this play includes most *naïve* and concise stage directions, or rather instructions for the *mise-en-scène*, in the days when actors managed all that for themselves; e.g., 'Let hell be on one side and the houses on the other, and 'then heaven . . . Galilee to be in the midst, an Emmaus 'also required; then, when everyone is seated and silence 'prevails, let Joseph of Arimathea approach Pilate and say: '—and thereupon follows the opening dialogue. In a Munich manuscript of the thirteenth century the mystery of the Nativity shows a delightful unconsciousness of all chronological trammels. Balaam on his ass, Isaiah and Daniel uplift their prophetic voices in unison. To them enter the chief of the Jewish synagogue, who, hearing the Virgin-birth predicted, denounces it straightway as a monstrosity dire enough to turn the stars in their courses and topsy-turvy the whole realm of nature, and 'rails in good set terms' on the prophet Isaiah for hazarding such an oracle. The latter leaves the argument for the defence to his distinguished contemporary, St. Augustin, who in orthodox fashion proceeds to demolish the unbeliever. In the twelfth century, while the vernacular was encroaching on the French stage, Latin and the Liturgy ruled the entire Teutonic development of the dramatic germ.

* M. Royer affirms that Latin plays, on subjects sacred or profane, continued to be performed in all continental countries down to the end of the eighteenth century.

Then we come upon the *lingua farcita* in which Latin and Old German appear by turns. Further in the thirteenth, although all 'mysteries' still follow simply the text of Scripture or holy legend, and the Passion-mystery is still the sun of the dramatic system, yet the vernacular has nearly overpowered the Latin, all the principal parts of the piece being in Old German; and, as we progress further, in stage directions only is Latin retained, and the whole delivery is in the people's tongue. The word 'Exit,' still retained in English dramatic literature, is probably the last vestige of these classical traditions. In the first editions of the Elizabethan dramatists, many of the stage directions are in Latin.

M. Royer doubts, and, we think, with good reason, whether the 'Mystery of St. Catherine,' performed in this country in the twelfth century, was done in English, and points out that Geoffroy,* its reputed author, was a Frenchman and a member of the University of Paris. He further insists that the 'Spectacles of London,' mentioned by William Fitzstephen in the second half of the same century, do not prove the existence of English dramas; and maintains that two centuries must yet elapse before we touch bottom in English at the miracle-plays by Chester of Coventry, and that, with the exception of France, and partially of Germany, from the fall of the Roman Empire to the end of the thirteenth century, Latin continued to be the exclusive dramatic vehicle. Thus the drama had scanty interest for the common people, and remained either a didactic form of worship, or, as in the case of Hroswitha and the extant plays of Terence, an amusement of the learned leisure of the cloister.

As regards Germany, M. Royer skips, with one or two general phrases at most, the entire fourteenth century and lands us in the fifteenth at the Meistersänger, with their organised societies of authors and actors. He dwells through sixty pages exclusively on France, with a glance merely at the Netherlands, which in the very late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries begin first to furnish materials for his review. The prevailing form of the French stage at this period is that of the 'Miracles de Notre Dame,' to which the Netherlandish pieces run parallel. Forty pieces seem to be extant under that name, but these are probably a mere fraction of the produce which a single province yielded. M. Royer regards these 'Miracles' as the repertory of a monastery. But there

* He was master of the school at Dunstable Abbey and afterwards abbot of the same. The performance was probably in Latin.

are broad popular features about some which he cites, especially about the 'drame bourgeois' of the 'Dame Gibour,' which seem to show an appeal to wider than conventual sympathies. M. Royer ascribes to them a dramatic invention and an aim at truth to nature not found in the works of the previous or following age, which would be strange if they were so purely monastic as he would have them. The plots always turn on celestial aid, mostly that of the Virgin, but sometimes that of an angel, as in 'Robert le Diable;' of the plot of which, not as cooked into an opera, but as drawn doubtless from the *fabliaux*, we will give a specimen outline. Robert is a young noble, fierce, unscrupulous, and steeped in every crime of a violent age. His father seeks by herald-messengers to reprove and reclaim him, but in vain; he ill-treats the messengers and scorns the message, and is accordingly by paternal decree banished. He has a last interview with his mother, not of filial tenderness, but threatening her sword in hand. She avows that, being by divine ordinance barren, she had invoked Satanic aid to remove the ban, and that his birth followed. On this Robert's horror of conscience is aroused at last. He goes to Rome, confesses, and has penance imposed—to herd with beggars and feed with dogs, and counterfeit the state of one mad and dumb. Meanwhile the Empire rings with the alarm of a Saracen invasion. The angel Gabriel shows him marvellous white armour and bids him arm. He does so and saves the Empire. The emperor's daughter is promised to the hero of the day, when forward comes a seneschal to claim her with counterfeit armour and a precisely similar wound to that received by Robert. The princess herself, 'qui a tout vu,' exposes the fraud; on which the Pope remits Robert's penance, but he persists in self-mortification. A hermit at last appears as the *deus ex machina* to declare the decree of heaven, cut short his penance, and crown his career with the nuptial blessing. In the older romance he turns hermit, and dies 'in the odour of sanctity,' and the crowning splendours of the drama are not nuptial but funereal. The whole is in octosyllabic rhyme, and shows how firm a grasp of incident and character the nascent drama of the fourteenth century had acquired in France.

The fifteenth century brings us to the 'Mystères Cycliques,' the aim of which was to give full development and completeness to the several parts of sacred story which had formed the themes of disconnected or merely outlined pieces before. They affect the completion of each cycle of events in one whole, and, to grasp their object effectually, ran sometimes to the

length of 40,000 lines, spread over an eight days' sustained performance, displayed on a stage a hundred feet long, sustained by vast scaffoldings abutting on house-fronts, and drew a vast concourse of spectators, exhausting the known resources of scenic art, device, and decoration at the period, and kindling an enthusiasm comparable to that of Athens in the palmy days of the Attic stage. Such was the *furor* thus excited that great risks sometimes beset the actors. The 'Christus' of a Passion-mystery is mentioned as narrowly escaping actual death on the cross, and the Judas of the same as almost hung in earnest. The Passion-mystery was, as usual, the centre of all interest; every fibre of the sacred text was made to spin a new coil. It would be utterly impossible therefore to attempt to give an idea of the full-length effect. But a few of the touches of dramatic colouring imparted may be gathered from the following snatches of M. Royer's text. St. John the Baptist is preaching—'on voyait le saint entouré de sauvages, de serpents et d'animaux hideux. Il disait aux spectateurs que ces bêtes représentaient l'image de leurs péchés;' and St. Mary Magdalene, converted from a life of vanity, 'ira lui baiser les pieds et répandre sur lui les précieux parfums qu'elle réservait pour ses toilettes.' The Judas expands into a character of much complexity, sudden reverses, and subtle intrigue. One drama assigns him an early life of exposure and adventure, modelled on the classic lines of *Œdipus*. After this he takes service with Pilate, who esteems him highly as a *bon compagnon*, and the link between this later stage and the earlier one is his shipwreck 'on the island of Iscariot.'

Side by side with these colossal pieces we find traces of Terence's comedies being still in request, and a single historical piece founded on the achievements, then recent, of Jeanne d'Arc is mentioned and analysed by M. Royer. It is spoken of as 'lately found in the archives of the Vatican,' and as having been annually played at Orleans in memory of its rescue by the Maid. It only carries the heroine through her career of victories, loyally sinking her capture, trial, and execution. The most racy and effective parts in the popular eye of the period were perhaps those of the stage demons, to whom the utmost license, both of costume and antics, appears to have been conceded, and whose presence was felt not only on the stage, but in various practical jokes on one another or the audience. In an older Mystery a stage direction bids them 'clatter their cauldrons and stewpans.' One may suppose how the hair of the audience would stand on end at

the sound, and may conjecture what a very different set of nerves it would tickle *now*. Stage demons with horns and scaly tails used to appear within living memory in the last scene of 'Don Giovanni' as ministers of retribution, but have lately been dropped in order to keep the ridiculous at a respectful distance. As reliefs to the public mind from the overstrain of these terrors, comedy and farce found their fitting place, and flourished as reagents to the terror and pity of the Passion-play.

Italy in the thirteenth century shows no vernacular drama, but hovers between Latin Church offices on the one hand and pantomime on the other. In the fourteenth we find, but still in Latin, a quasi-historical drama, in the larva stage of monologue recitation, founded on a subject from the national annals—that of Ezzelino, tyrant-duke of Padua. The story slightly recalls that of Robert le Diable, but crowns the hero's tyrannies and fluctuations of fortune with a fine moral effect in the massacre of 'himself and family.' Similarly Petrarch is credited with a Latin comedy, which is not extant. In the fifteenth century appeared the vernacular *rappresentazioni*, taken, however, from the legends of the saints or from Scripture story. The earliest by Féo Belcari, a Florentine, is said to contain a medley of tournaments, combats, songs, and dances, emulating such entertainments as amused our own childhood at Astley's Royal Amphitheatre. But in these *rappresentazioni* an angel always prologises, and often reappears to dismiss the audience with some maxim of Holy Writ—the moral at the end of the fable.

At the close of this century the classic vein of Italy opens, preferring, however, for its tragic model the stilted verbosity of Seneca. With the revival of classic themes on Italian soil the meretricious taint of rhetoric, which flavours Latin poetry from the silver age downward, revived also—*quippe solo natura subest*. The sentiments, moreover, are narrow, the composition flat, the turn of expressions less happy than in the French 'Cycliques;' and indeed the demand was rather for display than for good taste; and the enthusiasm was of that somnolent kind which is seen when a public, like that of Florence under the Medici, merely takes on trust what its august patrons give it. Even in the sixteenth century we find recitations modelled on those of the Virgilian shepherds, the pastoral dialogue easily expanding into a kindred drama, cumbering the stage of the Italian *renaissance*, e.g. in the 'Orfeo' of Poliziano, the 'Aminta' of Tasso, and the 'Pastor Fido' of Guarini. Public taste in histrionic performances was not really aroused even in

its Tuscan cradle. Italian tragedy of this period is shambled with horrors which would pollute, if they did not revolt, the mind. In comedy Italy inherited the happier inspirations of Plautus and Terence, and there were some few of her sons who could construe the remains of Menander, then probably extant in considerable bulk among the newly imported Greek MSS. But no appreciable effects of Greek comedy on the Italian stage can be traced. Still, under the powerful genius of Ariosto, of Machiavelli, and of Tasso, all of them comic writers, although more popularly known for other works, Italian comedy rose to a height which it has never since attained. The seventeenth century was content with translations from the great Spanish masters, then in the zenith of European fame, and with outline sketches of extemporaneous comedy, left for the native quickness of the actor's apprehension to fill up. Flaminio Scala in 1611 published a collection of such, just as divines have published skeleton sermons. A sacred drama, the 'Adamo' of Andreini, 1613-1641, has been thought, but doubtfully, to have given Milton his first dramatic idea of 'Paradise Lost.' In France, even in the fifteenth century, we find municipal interest enlisted in the performances, with an animated public paying for their places, eager to fill them, and bent on exercising the full privilege of popular censure so acquired.

In Spain we have an undoubted trace of an early satirical drama in a royal ordinance of 1260 for its suppression; permitting, at the same time, the representation of sacred subjects, but only in towns, not in villages. Hence we may infer a popular diffusion of rustic *facetie* on the Spanish stage, which the gradual extinction of ancient liberties and the growth of Church influence overpowered. Very probably they were personal satires on the clergy with the usual license of grimace and scurrility. A glimpse of true comedy, but ill sustained, peeps out about 1480-1510 in the 'Celestina' of Rojas and Cota and the 'Calandra' of Bibbiena; then we fall back again into mawkish dialogue or eclogue, and the orthodox *auto* which the Inquisition sanctioned. The 'Celestina,' known also as 'Calisto' and 'Melibœa,' ends tragically, but has been pronounced by Mr. Hallam * 'the earliest modern comedy known to be extant.' M. Royer describes it as a 'trop fidèle peinture de mœurs détestables.' The lines of pleasant comic sketches hover before us, ill-defined and incomplete, in the scenes of Lopez de Rueda, for some of which Cervantes wrote

* Literature of Europe, i. 361, ed. 1840.

prologues, as also plays on his own account, until we reach, at the end of the sixteenth century, the monarch of Spanish comedy, Lopez de Vega, the number of whose known plays is set at over six hundred, although the texts of rather more than two-thirds alone are extant. To these about a score of *autos sacramentales*, or directly sacred pieces, should be added. Among his extant comedies is one on the plot of Shakespeare's 'Romeo and Juliet,' but with the tragic element struck out of it. The lovers' marriage, at first concealed, is acknowledged by Capulet, and all ends happily. There is evidence that Lopez had no knowledge of his great contemporary's achievement on the same theme.

In Poland plays on historical subjects are said to be older than those on religious—a curious exception if true. Thus we hear of a scenic representation before Prince Premislas in 1290, in which the ghost of his own wife, whom he had recently murdered, was made to appear; but no extant manuscript is adducible in proof of this. The earliest repertory, dating from 1521, that of some Cracovian Dominicans, contains the usual 'Mysteries,' side by side with lighter dramatic diversions of the comic popular kind; while some pieces contain a satirical vein, dealing with the vices of the aristocracy, embedded in grave religious matter. The nobility, however, had their Latin theatre, with such pieces as 'Ulyssis Prudentia,' 'Judicium Paridis,' &c. A century later we find the story of Jephthah dramatised, but with a treatment borrowed from the similar classic theme, the sacrifice of Iphigenia at Aulis. As the Reformation reached Poland, its dramatic sentiment took up the defence of the old faith and ritual, and about the same time was even more eminently conservative in satirising the then novel planetary system of Copernicus.

As we trace Spanish drama into the seventeenth century, Calderon widens the road opened by Lopez, including tragic, historic, comic, and tragi-comic pieces. His hero is mostly the conventional *hidalgo*, gallant, jealous, resentful, revengeful, but his plots are more concisely packed, and have neater turns, his combinations and contrasts are more skilfully articulated and more nicely shaded. The genius of stage intrigue reaches its acme in him. Of his 520 known dramas only 180 are extant, of which perhaps a third have been translated into various languages of the neighbouring nations. Both he and Lopez were by turns soldier, poet, and ecclesiastic; and the triple thread of chivalry, gallantry, and religion, which runs through their scenes and tinges their sentiments, faithfully reflects the influences of their chequered careers. The father of modern

comedy, however, is Alarcon. He avoids the tedious descriptions which overload his predecessors' scenes, and shows a scenic instinct for what will strike the eye and ear at once in force of situation and truth of character. From him Corneille borrowed directly and entirely the characters, the intrigue and details of his 'Menteur.' Similarly he drew the famous 'Cid' on the lines of a Spanish piece by De Castro, transferring without stint situations, scenes, and passages of dialogue. Spain and France bear the dramatic palm from all continental nations in this seventeenth century. In the latter country the names of Corneille, Racine, and Molière leave a long track of lustre behind them, too broadly marked to need illustration here. The Cid is said to have had a distinct political value in the eyes of Richelieu, serving as a 'tub to the whale' of popular clamour, and diverting public criticism from his Spanish policy. Now for the first time we gain the starting-point of a continuous line of great actors. Indeed the value of the actor as an artist may be said to date from this period. M. Royer notes that Tirso de Molina, who died in 1648, the year of Murillo's marriage—a date thus connecting sister arts in Spain—has in his 'El Burlador de Sevilla,' *Le Séducteur de Séville*, given the prototype of 'Don Juan,' copied by Molière, and since become a property of all nations through the universal language supplied by the genius of Mozart. This may remind us that the stand-still of Italian dramatic genius in the same seventeenth century is chiefly due to the fact of the Italians being then concentrated in the development of opera; which first appeared at Florence in 1596, and in the following century took complete possession of the Roman and Venetian stage; was imported into France by Mazarin in 1646, and peeps out in England for the first time under the austere rule of puritanism about a decade later. The ballet begins first, but with the aid of partial dialogue or song, in the days of Henri III. of France. He and Henri IV. encouraged it, but only at their court theatres and private entertainments. The grave Sully himself, when Grand Master of the Arsenal, built a big theatre for it, and was solicited by a court lady to take a part. Bassompierre, Marshal of France, is credited, in conjunction with several nobles of the highest rank, with extemporising a ballet to quiz their sovereign lord, Louis XIII. Ballet, however, did not run itself quite free of dialogue and song, and become a mutely mimetic drama, until the eighteenth century.

The Slavonic drama has its earliest national title-deeds in a Teheck MS. ascribed to the latter part of the thirteenth

century, with the stage directions, as in the kindred German play, still in Latin. On comparing, however, the *Teheck* with the German, M. Royer assigns the priority to the *Tcheck* on the score of greater simplicity of structure. He notes that the Churches of Dalmatia, Croatia, Bohemia, and Poland paid religious allegiance to Rome and the West, Russia and Bulgaria to Greece and the East, and that their dramatic impress followed that allegiance. The piece which this MS. contains is entitled '*Mastickar*,' and means properly a seller of drugs, from the well-known '*mastiek*,' but is nearly equivalent in use to the French '*Charlatan*.' This piece was probably a part only of a Passion-mystery, which formed a larger whole. In it the '*Three Marys*' come to buy their '*spices and ointments*.' Ruben, the *Mastickar*'s apprentice, assumes that they want the perfumes as cosmetics; for the sublime and the ridiculous had not even a step between them, but went arm in arm, in those simple days.

Thus, then, we have followed the development of the national drama among all the leading states of Europe down to the seventeenth century. It may be worth while to trace the same in our own country with a little more fulness. We will pass by, as a mere parallel variety of which sufficient examples have already been given, the nursery drama which flourished in the Middle Ages under the protectorate of the Church, of which some early specimens have been recorded above, and start from the time when stage-players in England were mere dependants of royalty and nobility. We find flourishing at this period, that of the early Tudors, a social form of the drama, termed a '*disguising*,' in which no strict line separated actors from spectators, which seems to have been highly popular in great houses, and at the Court itself under Henry VII. and Henry VIII.,* as well as a more

* A '*Booke of all manner of orders concerning an Earle's House*,' cited by Collier, vol. i. pp. 24-5, bears a date in Henry VII.'s reign, but, as the handwriting is described as late Henry VIII.'s, it is probably re-copied. It contains elaborate rules for a pageant dance performed by '*disguisers*,' who are to come in, '*make their obeysaunce, and daunce such daunces as they be appointed*,' and '*when they have doon, the Morris to come in incontinent as is appointed*.' It provides for the share of women in the pageant, in which case they are '*to come in first*,' as by a courteous recognition of the dues of chivalry. This suggests something quite different from the presence of the professional actress, a class which, indeed, in England did not exist until much later. The book recognises, further, a '*maister of the disguisings*,' as well as a '*maister of the revills*,' each being a distinct officer with discretionary powers.

distinctly histrionic form, that known as the 'interlude,' performed in the pauses of stately banquets to amuse the guests, and in which, therefore, the line of distinction was inherent in the circumstances. Organised dramatic entertainments were less frequent, and might follow any of the customary forms which the Church had bequeathed, or which the revival of classical taste was introducing. Thus Henry VIII., we find, took over a company of players from his father's household, and in 1514 set up another, distinguishing the former as 'the king's old players.' The 'Gentlemen of the Chapel' and 'Children of the Chapel' were also on occasion converted into 'comedians,' a service which the traditions of the Church redeemed from the imputation of novelty. One of these latter was John Heywood, a boy at the time, who became afterwards of some note as a poet and dramatist.

'Interludes,' from the frequent introduction of them, became the most current form of dramatic entertainment, and that term the one best known in popular use as generally descriptive of it.* Thus Henry VIII., besides making the 'Mastership of the Revels,'† in 1546 or earlier, a permanent office, whereas before it had been occasional only, had also a standing corps of 'players of interludes;' and in Heywood's 'Interludes,' which begin about 1530, we have the first strongly marked departure from the miracle plays and morals, or moralities, of the early Church style. Mr. Collier remarks, in his 'Annals of the Stage,' that these interludes 'have frequently both clever humour and strong character to recommend them.' The entertainment known as a 'masque' appears in 1513, as a novelty newly imported from Italy, in which the king himself 'with eleven other appeared disguised after the manner' of that country. How it differed from a 'disguising' is not clear. But probably it had something more distinctly dramatic in the way of plot and incident, derived from the classic traditions of which Italy was the home. We know that it had such later, from the lovely exemplar of 'Comus;'

* Thus 'interludes' is the generic term for all theatrical representations in the Declaration of Lawful Sports on Sundays in 1618. and occurs similarly in early enactments touching the stage.

† Termed in the patent 'Magister iocorum, revillorum et mascorum.' The 'mask,' as mentioned above in the text, had then newly been introduced at Court. The 'masques' in 'Merchant of Venice,' act ii. sc. 5, are a public entertainment in the open streets. In 'Romeo and Juliet,' act i. sc. 4, the allusions to 'prologue' and 'prompter' show that the masking which follows had dramatic affinities, although dropped, to further the plot of the masquers.

and it appears to have continued popular at the Court of the early Stuart princes. Nor did Charles I. and his queen, whose foreign tastes it eminently suited, disdain to mingle among the masked performers in the semi-private theatricals of their household. We may add that in 1520 we have the first mention of a Latin play, 'a goodly comedy of Plautus,' presumably intended for the recreation of French hostages of high distinction, then in the king's hands for the surrender of Tournay, Latin being then and later the accepted medium of foreign communication. Latin plays, however, formed a staple amusement of scholastic and learned bodies. It seems likely that St. Paul's School, as well as Westminster, in which alone it still survives, gave such performances; although the 'Children of Powle's' and those 'of Westminster' is an ambiguous term, applying equally to the chorister scholars of either cathedral in the year 1528. Nor, indeed, are the Westminster scholars clearly distinct from these latter until the Queen's refoundation under charter in 1560. It is recorded, however, that 'the Boys of the Grammar Skolle of Westminster played before the Queen' at 'Twelfthtyde' in 1564. Richard Mulcaster, the first Master of Merchant Taylors' School, certainly wrote a play, probably in Latin, which the 'boys under him' performed at some time later than 1560-1, the date of this school's foundation. The period 1550-65 gives us the first clear examples of English comedy in 'Ralph Royster Doyster,' 'Misogonus,' and 'Gammer Gurton's Needle.' In 1592 we find a rather amusing passage between the Privy Council and the university authorities at Cambridge, who, seeking to purge their seat of learning of 'interludes and plays, some of them being full of lewd examples and most of vanity,' had inhibited a performance at the neighbouring village of Chesterton, and proceeded the next year to request of Lord Burghley fuller powers against actors, 'that badd kinde of people who are (as we thinke) the most ordinary carriers and dispensers of the infection of the plague.' While the university was thus upholding *bonos mores* on sanitary principles, and banning 'that badd kinde of people,' the players, as the irony of fate would have it, there came by special messenger a royal command, directing an English comedy to be got up at Cambridge for her Majesty's entertainment, inasmuch as her own actors could not, owing to the prevalence of the plague, perform before her at the coming Christmas. The Vice-Chancellor wrote to request that the play might be in Latin, 'the English vaine nothing beseminge our students.' In 1594-5 the university provided

a performance of 'certaine comœdies and one tragicdie,' when we find the then Vice-Chancellor, who was himself the author of the Latin tragedy of King Richard III.—perhaps the 'one 'tragedie' so favoured—writing to request the loan of the royal wardrobe from the Tower, 'upon sufficient security, 'there being in that tragicdie sundry personages of greatest 'astate to be represented in ancient princely attire.'

In the reign of Elizabeth stage players are feeling their way to become a distinct profession. The Common Council of London, in reply to the patronage and introduction which the royal patent of 1574 insured to Burbadge's (*sic*) company 'as well within our cyty of London and liberties of 'the same as within other cyties,' urge first that constant topic which was the most presentable argument against the stage, viz. the danger of plague-contagion thence arising. They then proceed to note that heretofore players *had not made their living by their art*, but 'used other honest and 'lawfull artes,' and then learned some 'interludes' for extra gain 'in vacant time of recreation.' This shows that a new profession was setting itself up, and that the fact was viewed with suspicious jealousy by civic authority. The whole calling of an actor had hitherto been a mere 'interlude' in the graver affairs of life. It was now to be a substantive calling, *and the art must maintain the artist*.* The deeper cause of antipathy was the growth of puritanic feeling which had made its way largely among municipal bodies, and to which the statute of 1574 was no doubt traceable. At Leicester, in 1572, Lord Worcester's players defied the mayor, and performed in spite of him, but had to submit and apologise. At Banbury,†

* In their address to the Privy Council, 1575, 'Her Ma'tie's poor 'players' urge that 'the tyme of our service draweth very neere,' that they must practise in order to be ready when required by the queen, i.e. at Christmas and Twelfth Night especially (the dedication of which festival to the drama is preserved in the title of Shakespeare's comedy of that name), and that meanwhile they must live; and, 'the season 'of the year being past to play at any of the houses without the city of 'London,' they request letters to the lord mayor of London and justices of Middlesex, to enable them to play within their jurisdictions. This shows that the statute 11 Eliz. was practically adverse to the players, and that the patent of 1574 was an attempt to restore to a select body of them the protection so infringed. They still found that statute too strong for them, and request royal or privy council letters accordingly.

† 'More devout than a weaver of Banbury' is a proverbial phrase in Davenant about this same time. So Ben Jonson makes 'Zeal-o'-the-land Busy' (a Puritan character in his 'Bartholomew Fair') a Banbury man (Collier, vol. i. p. 473 and notes).

where puritanism was rampant in 1633, the mayor and justices lodged a company of players as 'wandering roages' (*sic*) in the common gaol, although bearing a royal patent and the commission of the 'Master of the Revels.'* This was when the tide of puritanic feeling had wellnigh reached its height, but it serves to illustrate the tendency all along. Middle-class respectability being thus largely adverse to them, the players were forced back on the protection of the Crown and the nobles on the one hand, and on the favour of the lower classes on the other. There was, indeed, much to be said on the side of civic authority. The players were most in request at seasons of festivity when license most prevailed. The feeble powers of police at the period found it easier to prohibit the incentives to disorder than to keep them within due limits. The defective sanitary arrangements and ignorance of the means to prevent or combat contagion caused an alarm, as times went, from which London and the older popular centres were hardly ever entirely free. Thus the Privy Council propose as their limit the number of fifty deaths per week by plague as that within which plays should be permitted (1574-5) in London; and James I., in a patent to the Blackfriars House, forbade performances when such deaths were over forty per week. Between plague and Lord Chamberlain, Justice Shallow and constable Dogberry, the players must have had a bad time of it. Besides this argument, which, as unanswerable, leads their file of objections, the Common Council, in their order for the City of London, 1575, allege the 'corruption of youth with incontinence,' the 'wasting time and thrift,' the 'provoking the wrath of God, the 'ground of all plagues,' the 'withdrawing the people from the 'resort to public prayer,' and add that plays were 'daily cried 'out against by all preachers.' And still more outspokenly, in their previous correspondence with the Privy Council, they urge 'how uncomely it is for youth to runne streight from prayer 'to playes, from God's service to the devell's,' and that 'to 'play in plage (*sic*) time is to increase the plage by infection; 'to play out of plage time is to draw the plage by offendinge

* The Banbury authorities professed to suspect some tampering with one or both of these documents. The Privy Council professed to adopt the suspicion, remanded the players, after some days in gaol, to London, examined and released them under bond 'to be forthcoming whensoever they should be called for'—clearly a course of policy, in order not to clash with local authority backed by popular feeling. (Collier, vol. i. p. 475.)

‘ of God upon occasion of such playes.’ In this dilemma, the objects of suspicion to the ‘ unco guid’ of the time, on the score alike of physical and moral contagion, the players were like the flying fish between wind and water. If they attempted even a tour of the provinces when an alarm of plague was reigning, the plague-terror followed them to the country, and made the rustics shy of them. In the early Elizabethan period the players retained by divers noble houses exhibited in nearly all the large towns, and generally with the assistance of their corporations. But, as puritanism leavened the municipal mind, the amusements authorised on occasions of burgher festivity ceased to include theatricals of any sort. Thus, outside the privileged circle of royalty and nobility, the drama was banned from civic limits.* The more, however, they were prohibited in the city and liberties, the more they flourished in the outskirts. Thus, in the last thirty years of the century, eleven houses were built,† all just beyond the landmark of the Lord Mayor’s jurisdiction; and all were in use, either permanently or occasionally, at the beginning of the next century. The drama grew in the favour of the populace, perhaps by the very fact that it incurred the frown of municipal authority. These houses, however, were not erected without a frequent struggle on the part of the resident neighbours, who regarded them, and with some reason, as a nuisance. Popular as was the resort to the play, the neighbourhood of a play-house was avoided. The rise of the Blackfriars House in 1576, and its rebuilding in 1596, were alike the subject of

* The order of Common Council, 1575, not only forbade within the city and liberties stage plays containing any words or action of immoral or seditious tendency, and interdicted the use of any innkeeper’s premises for any dramatic entertainment, the book of which was not first ‘ perused and allowed’ by a censor of their own, but added other restrictions plainly meant to make such representations within their jurisdiction impossible.

† These were as follows:—The Theatre and the Curtain, in Shore-ditch, opened 1570; the Blackfriars, 1576; the Whitefriars, 1576; the Newington Butts, 1580; the Rose, Bankside, 1585; the Hope, Bankside, 1585; the Paris Garden, 1588; the Globe, 1594; the Swan, 1595; the Fortune, 1599. Of these the Globe was the ‘ summer house,’ and the Blackfriars the ‘ winter house,’ of the same company, including, with Shakespeare and Richard Burbage (son of the Burbadge mentioned on p. 10), Thomas Pope, John Hemmings, Augustine Phillips, William Kempe, William Slye, and Nicholas Tooley. Besides the above-named erections, the Blackfriars playhouse was nearly rebuilt in 1596. The puritan City party made a strong attempt in 1599 to reduce these to two, but signally failed.

hostile petitions from its neighbours, but without effect. Being the site of a dissolved monastery, the region at this time was probably a purlieu of royal jurisdiction, and thus afforded a sanctuary to the distressed players, near enough for the citizens' winter resort, when they were unwilling to face the risks of returning in the dusk from the 'Bankside.' From the badged and liveried servants of the Crown or the nobility issued, in the first instance, probably all the companies which played at these houses. They gradually grew to depend on the public more, and on noble patrons less. They built themselves houses where they could, like swallows at the eaves, just on the outside edge of the municipal pale; but the houses always belonged to the companies, not, as later, the companies to the houses; and the impress of union which each company received when they were one nobleman's servants, they retained long after they had achieved independence of that tie. This exceptional *status* made them the subject of unusual legislation and jurisdiction. Enjoying a large measure of favour from the Crown, at a time when the Crown was disproportionately powerful, they were allowed a large measure of license by popular feeling, and were proportionally obnoxious to all local authorities. Thus the actors were a sort of *fera natura*, and the regulations under which they were placed were something like the game laws—an abnormal legislation arising from an eccentric position.

Outside such regular companies were an unrecognised and promiscuous set of artistic Bohemians, reaching down to the acrobatic, funambulist, and pantomimic amusers of the public, including jugglers, tumblers, and clowns. These wandered about to wakes and fairs, shunning honest labour, neglecting at a pinch the scrupulous niceties of *meum* and *tuum*, and catering for the mirthful moments of the mixed multitude; and were more closely allied to the 'vagrom' class than the surgeon to the barber, the painter to the glazier, or the chemist to the druggist. Reserving themselves at the greater festivals for the larger centres, they took advantage of the large crop of local holidays which the wake or fair represented, faithfully visiting every shrine of provincial mirth as the calendar brought it round. The mediæval Church had purveyed the amusements of its public under the guise of lessons of piety, even as it in several countries provided society with pawnbrokers under the guise of charity. Now, the strolling crew of players and mountebanks caught up, free from its responsibilities, the tradition of festive representation which fell from the ecclesiastic's hand; and to the 'miracles, mysteries, and

‘moralities’ succeeded entertainments combining too often the wit of a tap-room with the ethics of a bagnio. Caring only to hit the public humour easily and cheaply, they found their easiest market that for the coarse stimulants of scurrility, as knowing that whole audiences will laugh in public at what each would be ashamed of in private. The irregularities which festive license tolerated on occasion only, as chartered *libertate Decembri*, became the fixed standard of the life of the strolling comedian. Classified with ‘rogues and vagabonds,’ they lived under the lash of society, and were pretty sure to earn the castigation fully, and perhaps leave something of a balance due. The law itself had echoed the social voice in fixing a stigma on all the scattered members of a widely ranging profession, save a specially privileged minority. Puritanic feeling viewed that minority as ministering to the pleasant vices of the Court and the nobles, and extended the same censure to them too. Thus the Common Council, in 1575, stigmatises the predecessors of Burbage and Shakespeare as those ‘whoe, if they were not her Ma’tie’s servants, should by ‘their profession be rogues.’

But the histrionic episode of ‘Bottom’ in the ‘Midsummer Night’s Dream’ suggests that, the face of local magistracy being thus set against the drama, the lower ranks of the free men in the civic body, who had some appetite for fun, and scanty resources and traditions of art, sometimes took upon themselves to organise such entertainments. The sock-and-buskin business, thrust away by the furred and gold-chained magnates, was taken up, we may suppose, by such ‘rude mechanicals’ as are represented by Nick Bottom, Peter Quince, and Co. The greatest and most influential of the Tudor sovereigns, Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, had an inborn love of pageant, a strong instinct of its usefulness as a means of popularity, and a simple coarseness of taste in gratifying it which was racy of the soil of their own popular origin. Thus it seems likely that neither of these princes would have declined with contempt an entertainment of the class caricatured in the ‘most lamentable comedy,’ had it been offered. Possibly Elizabeth might even have welcomed such, as a rebuke to the municipal dignity starched with puritanism which thwarted her Council’s encouragement of the higher class of drama. If Shakespeare had heard of such an incident in a royal progress—for instance, in the notable one to Kenilworth in his own Warwickshire—it would have sufficed for the germ of his idea of the clowns playing before ‘Duke’ Theseus. But then such companies of ‘casuals,’ performing

after their kind, would be ready-made butts to the wit of the trained players of royal or noble houses, who would have a proper sense of the distance which separated such stage-refuse from themselves. Thus we may suppose that the drama, besides the professionals, whether of the royal train or of some noble's, or vulgar strollers, found a third class of occasional supporters in the municipal dregs of the towns. The popular but hazy distinction of the 'legitimate' drama is derived from the line which separated the first of these from the other two.

Before quitting the facts of histrionic history, we may remark that the clown, so copiously introduced by Shakespeare, where there is little or nothing in the plot to suggest it, is derived from the 'vice' or fool of the old moralities. This is confirmed by a passage in 'Twelfth Night,' act iv. sc. 2, where the clown sings—

‘ I'll be with you again
In a trice,
Like to the old *vice*,
Your need to sustain ;
Who with dagger of lath,
In his rage and his wrath,
Cries ah ha ! to the devil,’ &c.

But it may be questioned whether, as a matter of fact, since the earliest legitimate players were the king's household servants, the king's jester, who would always have his prescriptive place among them, did not form a large factor in the Shakespearian clown. The rest amused only on the red-letter days in the royal calendar of mirth ; but the fool, like a 'pickled herring,' was always in season, and would surely be most in season then. Thus to introduce some comic business of which he might be the vehicle, whether the piece was tragic or comic on the whole, seems a necessary result of his presence and office.

Mr. Payne Collier's work on the 'Annals of the Stage' is thoroughly bottomed on genuine research, led by carefully trained accuracy. In glancing at Mr. Percy Fitzgerald's more recent work, we must retrace here and there some of the ground already traversed in the previous remarks. Those volumes are marred by a general looseness of structure, shambling method of narration, slovenliness of phrase, and inaccuracy in names. To speak of 'a royal personage of quality' is surely 'to paint the lily.' On page 9 we find ourselves 'under Charles II.,' whose 'Master of the Revels looked after the comedians and exacted his fees sternly. Mr. Malone quotes the diary of Sir Henry Herbert who filled this office,

‘ which shows clearly that the players being “his Majesty’s “servants” was no Court fiction. Thus in November 1632 (!) ‘ he writes,’ &c. So that the example of the Master of the Revels’ strictness (in forbidding mimicry of real persons about the court) in Charles II.’s time is really taken from the reign of Charles I. On the next page we work back to 1603, James I.; and in another page again reach Sir H. Herbert and 1635. On pages 7–8 we have 39 Eliz. c. 4, and 1 James I. c. 1, referred to, as fixing the ‘vagabond’ status of the ‘common ‘player,’ and even of the usually protected ‘servants of his ‘Majesty,’ if found ‘wandering abroad.’ But on page 41 ‘we now come to another Act of Parliament,’ i.e. the same 39 Eliz. c. 4 over again. Whereas the earliest statute which fixes that *status*, unless for those sheltered by royal &c. protection or by justices’ license, is one twenty-five years earlier, 14 Eliz. c. 5, referred to on page 37; that is thirty pages too late. Of slips in names examples are, ‘Ralph Alleyn,’ for which read ‘Edward Alleyn,’ vol. i. p. 22; also ‘Shakespeare ‘and Johnson,’ p. 63, where ‘Jonson,’ the famous Ben, is intended. ‘Cuddle Wharf,’ p. 43, should be ‘Puddle Wharf.’ ‘Dr. Fennison,’ p. 117, should be ‘Dr. Tennison’ or ‘Tennis-son.’ Constant repetitions of the same story, or references to it, occur within a few pages, sometimes thrice over. The art of bookmaking may claim a new departure in Mr. Percy Fitzgerald. It would fill a couple of pages of this Journal to detail his slips, errors, and confusions, in his first 250 pages. We cannot spare space to sweep up litter at this rate, and must pass on.

The Restoration sought to restore all things from the Church and Crown downwards, including therefore the stage. The Church was put back, like a holy image into its niche, and soldered there with base metal. The stage, as being an institution more to the personal taste of the sovereign, and keeping up his *rôle* of the ‘Merry Monarch,’ suffered relatively greater degradation through its closer contact with his personal influence. The Church he ‘severely let alone,’ the stage he fondly patronised.

The patents now first granted permanently gave Killigrew and Davenant a virtual monopoly. No one could build a theatre, put a dramatic piece on the stage, or act a part in its performance, without either the concurrence of one of them or the risk of penalties. The existing players had thus no choice but to take service with one or the other. The policy pursued by each was much the same, viz. to draw to his side the strongest company he could, and form them, or their leading

spirits, into a commercial company, engaging them to build a new theatre, and allowing them certain shares in the profits, but requiring a daily rent of them in their professional capacity for the use of the house when built. Davenant seems to have had the best head for the business, and was beforehand in engaging the best actors, notably Betterton, the chief star of the period. Killigrew's chief activity lay in jesting and tippling, with other kindred pursuits, such as the accumulating patents, places, and pensions from the too easy-going king, all which failed, however, to keep him from embarrassment. His death in 1682 left his property squandered, his widow destitute, and his house deeply pledged. Davenant started at the 'Salisbury Court house' and the 'Cockpit,' houses already existing. Killigrew kept on for a while the old-fashioned 'Red Bull'—an inn accommodated to theatrical purposes—but soon started afresh in a house near Clare Market, then newly built by his company. In 1661 we find Davenant opening a rival house close to this in Lincoln's Inn Fields, and Killigrew, not to be outdone, another in Drury Lane—a site since become historical in the English drama—which was burnt down about ten years later. This again was trumped by the ambitious rivalry of Davenant's son, Dr. Davenant, who outdid them all by a still newer and more expensive structure, raised by the help of speculative shareholders, in Dorset Gardens, whither the Lincoln's Inn company migrated in 1671. The loss of Drury Lane by fire was soon repaired by a new structure on the same site, but plain in comparison with the splendour of the Dorset Gardens house. But the rivalry was disastrous to both the patentees, especially to Killigrew, whose bad management and improvident habits could ill sustain it. His death precipitated an arrangement which had been in contemplation before, the union of the rival patents into one interest. Thus the monopoly became closer than ever—so close that the public and the actors both rebelled against it. Betterton led the desertion from the camp, and a royal license from William III., overriding the monopoly of previous patents, allowed him to build, by subscription from 'people of quality,' another new theatre within the walls of a tennis-court, but still in Lincoln's Inn Fields, which was opened with Congreve's 'Love for Love' in April 1695. Thus we find at the end of the century two principal houses and companies, as in 1660; but one, Drury Lane, representing the united forces of *both* the original patentees in the person of Charles Rich, to whom the representative of the Davenants had sold his patent rights, and whose unpopular and despotic treatment had helped on the

secession; while the other embodied the venture of the seceders and their subscribing supporters. This latter was the legitimate ancestor of the house on the subsequently famous site in Covent Garden, built in 1732. The Dorset Gardens house still continued, but as a secondary to the Drury Lane one, in the same interests; and we hear of it, still under Rich's management, as late as 1707. In this site the drama had found a footing within the liberties of the city, and, something of the old jealousy reawakening when it was proposed in 1700 to rehabilitate it, it went gradually to decay and was razed in 1709. The tradition of two principal houses, which so long governed the London stage, was thus firmly established. But, singularly enough, Rich, after a long management at Drury Lane, lived to rebuild the Lincoln's Inn Fields house, and carried all the rights of the original patentees with him thither in the reign of George I. Meanwhile, in the reign of Queen Anne, the 'Haymarket Opera' had been added, often alluded to in the pages of Addison's 'Spectator'; and we have thus a principal group of houses and arrangements connected with them, which perpetuated themselves down to living memory; the Adelphi and the Olympic sprang up as satellites to these; and, more remotely, Sadler's Wells and the Surrey Theatre served to amuse the northern and southern suburbs respectively.

Thus, to sum up, it appears that by the close of the seventeenth century, the more advanced nations of Europe had all, with the exception of Germany, fixed their characteristic types. The political chaos into which Germany had drifted owing to the 'Thirty Years' War is partly responsible for this; but further, dramatic genius of a high order had not as yet so far awakened in Germany as to call out and marshal those elements, ethnical and artistic, which constitute national drama. In Germany those elements continue to lie fallow till the eighteenth century. In France, Italy, and our own country, that definite type had been reached, and only diversifies itself afterwards within the range of national taste and spreads itself with the modern development of manners and society. Germany has on the whole benefited by having so greatly reserved her forces. The determining influence of her leaders in poetic genius has thus acted on the German stage like a force applied further from the fulcrum, or a mould impressed at a temperature when fusion is more perfect. As a set-off against this, German genius missed even that afterglow of the ages of faith which fell on the Elizabethan drama. Omitting therefore Germany, we may say that Shakespeare and his contemporaries rescued our

own country from the depraving influence of Seneca and rhetorical tragedy, and mitigated that influence among the Latin nations. There are symptoms in the avowed imitations of the younger Heywood, and in the exaggerated horrors of the stage of Marlow and Kid, of a similar influence dominating among ourselves, when the great master arose to rebuke it, and, in the advice of Hamlet to the players, gave wholesome teaching, which probably his own example embodied. And when, a century later, Dryden degraded his genius to the imitation of an imitation, to reproduce in English those who had reproduced Seneca in French, the disease came in a mitigated form, like the virus of small-pox to a patient fortified previously by vaccination, and did not strike home to the vitals nor root itself in the system. Dryden, indeed, failed grandly; but he deserved to fail. The keenly-facetted style of workmanship achieved by the great Frenchmen of the seventeenth century shines blurred and garbled in the paste-jewellery of the restoration school. The moral decadence was even more lamentable than the artistic. In Dryden religion is made, if we may so express it, a mere spoon for uncleanness, and the forms of the confessional supply the intrigues of the pander. He touches hands with Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Farquhar. His touch is heavier and theirs lighter; but the same pitch sticks to all their fingers. Once substitute for the 'two great Commandments' of the Law the twin code of gallantry and honour, and we have a key to the moral system of all four, and of all their minor imitators. After Rowe the 'Cato' of Addison and the 'Irene' of Johnson land us at the low-water mark of the middle Hanoverian era; then Garrick comes to the footlights, and Shakespeare's ascendancy revives. That ascendancy remains ever a force in reserve, a vast central current in the dramatic channel, exercising a determining influence upon the eddying shallows and ditch-fed backwaters which line the nearer margin of the stream. The quest of violent stimulants may lead authors to rake the kennel for a hero; the passion for accessories of splendour may stifle action in pageant for a while; but the influence of Shakespeare will always make a revival of healthier instincts and a return to truer models possible to the most degenerate age. He has become a part of the national conscience, and wields in the last resort the moral empire of the buskin and the sock.

Thus at the present moment the company led by Miss E. Terry and Mr. H. Irving are the Shakespearian salt of the London stage. The two whom we name tower, indeed, above the rest with an extinguishing pre-eminence. For reasons of

physique, perhaps, on which it would be invidious to dwell, 'Much Ado about Nothing' suits them better than 'Romeo and Juliet.' But when these two protagonists have the stage to themselves, immortal conceptions find due expression, and the entertainment may refresh those memories, if any remain, that go back to the first quarter of this century. Among the rest, the two old gentlemen brothers, Leonato and Antonio, although weak in parts where strong feeling is required, are the best sustained. The Dogberry of Mr. S. Johnson rises sometimes above mediocrity, and is good in details; but the self-conceit bubbling over with indignation into which the part expands is feebly rendered. The 'go to' of Shakespeare's vocabulary has indeed a depth of contemptuous, vilipending rebuke in it, which it is not easy to express to modern ears.*

Of the modern drama and the present condition of the stage we have but little to say. To judge by the countless theatres springing up in the metropolis, and the audiences which throng them night after night, never were dramatic performances so popular, never was the stage so liberally patronised. Times have vastly changed since, some forty years ago, public meetings were held in London to consider the depressed state of the drama. The patronage of the Court, and the growing love of amusement amongst the people, have solved that difficulty. Yet in spite of this profuse encouragement, and the manifest improvements which have taken place in our theatres and in the *matériel* of the stage, we cannot discover any corresponding advance in the literary productions of the drama. It is long since any original tragedy or comedy of first-rate excellence has been presented to the public. The literary standard of the stage is pitifully low; if it were higher, perhaps it would not attract the public. Mr. Tennyson's plays have not proved very successful, though 'The Cup' is a work of singular merit, and was admirably performed. Mr. Herman Merivale's tragedy, 'The White Pilgrim,' has passages of great beauty, and deserves to rank amongst the most poetical of modern dramas; but it was soon withdrawn, and the author, an experienced play-writer, complains, in his preface, that there is no demand for high literary conceptions on the modern stage. The genius of the dramatist is wanting, but what is still more fatal is the low taste and degenerate feeling of the audiences. Sheridan can still touch them by his inexhaustible wit, but Shakespeare

* It is probably the remnant of a profane expression docked of its offensive element, and was originally 'go to ———.' In 'sdeath' the amputation is at the beginning.

alone remains in possession of the power to rouse the nobler passions and touch the present feelings of the British public. All the rest is 'leather and prunella.' We hardly care to notice it.

As an example of art at the costermonger level, the 'Romany 'Rye' may be cited. It is a serio-comedy of cadgers, poorly played at the Princess's Theatre, but played better than it deserves, and holds a similar dramatic grade to that which the 'Police News' does in literature. As for the actors, whatever their individual merits, as a cast they are poor. In such a performance it must needs be so. There is a lack of subordination to any ruling idea, artistic or moral, in the details of the piece itself, which makes stage discipline among them impossible. Studies from the Newgate dock, the thieves' crib, the workhouse ward, the tramps' cellar, sometimes connected with the plot, sometimes resting independently on their pure artistic merits, crowd repulsive images on the mind, until criticism is lost in impatience. Witty and clever nonsense, glorified by Mr. W. S. Gilbert and melodised by Mr. A. Sullivan, is to be found in 'Patience, an Æsthetic Opera.' Where all talk or sing nonsense alike, there is an end of all character, or rather no beginning. But this defect of 'Patience' is the logical consequence of the author's deliberate choice, and we must take him as he chooses to be found.

'Life would be supportable but for its amusements,' said Sir George Lewis, and with less exaggeration one might say, there would be some fun yet on the London stage but for its farces, or rather farce-players; for there is sparkle enough in many of the pieces if it could but find vent. But it goes like a damp firework or a leaden shuttlecock. With one amusing exception, itself degraded by vulgarism, the cap-and-bells of the stage has become a nightcap. One asks oneself, are the supernumeraries and scene-shifters taking a turn at the footlights? But no! The fact is, the custom of putting on a farce before the chief piece, for the twenty minutes or so during which the reserved seats are filling, flattens the acting fatally. Feeling that they are there only to mark time, the actors have all the 'go' taken out of them. But farce having thus lost caste, modern comedy, not, of course, Shakespearian, tends to lose caste too, and slip into the place of the former. Such a hybrid is 'The Overland Route'—an 'original comedy' by convention only. The best makes-up and the liveliest points in 'Money' are made by dragging the genius of Lytton down to a farcical level. The frolic memories of Liston, Charles Mathews, Keeley, and Robson flit between us and the pro-

scenium, as we sit and chafe at a too tolerant public, and think that the applause should rather come from the stage, as a tribute to the exemplary patience of the boxes and stalls. Surely the greatest curiosities of current literature are the theatrical articles in the London newspapers! The critic smiles at them; the moralist muses and sighs. Still, the theatre goes on somehow; and so long as the imagination forms the large factor in human nature which we find it doing, and opens an inward *diverticulum* from the practical and prosaic burdens of the mind, so long the drama, in all its kinds, opera and ballet included, though it drag sometimes a weary life, will never die.

For the players who choose for their life's calling that ministry of diversion, society in this country always has a light esteem. Above all, for the human person to become the professional vehicle of public amusement, and let for hire its features and gestures, in stage display, entails a secret offence to the inbred *morgue* of society, which discredits the histrionic calling, however unjustly. Nor is this sentiment peculiar to England. On the contrary, the class of dramatic performers has long been held in greater respect in this country than on the continent. The Kembles, the Macreadys, the Ellen Trees, the Helen Faucits have ennobled it. The prejudice against the profession of the stage is far stronger in France and Italy than with us. Roman law marked actors with a touch of infamy; the Roman Church denied them so much as a consecrated grave. Even in Paris, not strict or prudish in such things, something of the old disdain survives; and it was a marvel when the most accomplished comedian of the day received from the President of the Republic the decoration of the Legion of Honour.

Still, it must be confessed that there is a close analogy between the temptations of the turf and those of the stage. The former lead the jockey to scale as light in truth and in honesty as he seeks to do in *avoirduois*, reserving sometimes, but not invariably, the duty of his engagement to the colours for which he rides. The latter incline the actor, and still more the actress, to make life a masquerade of flash and glare, a whirligig of sudden triumph and precipitate reverse. For both alike, that most brittle and least moral of all tests, success before the public eye, tends to become a gradually larger and larger factor, and character and conscience sink under the influence of professional habit. These are the temptations, not of course irresistible, but grave and real, which beset the profession of 'those who live to please;' and these have so far prevailed in moulding the traditions of the stage in the past, that they

tend to exclude any close scrutiny of moral character in the members of a company. Unless he rises above those traditions, no manager will care to press such a question. It is as much outside his province to consider it, as it was outside that of a recruiting sergeant of the great Frederic, who merely wanted his men to be six feet high. It is impossible that such traditional facts should not result in something of an *ἀτιμία*, a social disrating founded upon a moral sentiment, similar to that of oriental castes, which rests on one ceremonial or socially artificial.

The male performer is comparatively a pachyderm, being proof against imputations which sting the female reputation to death. Thus on the head of the weakest and frailest falls the whole, or all but the whole, of the obloquy, which, if due at all, should be divided between the public who demand, and the male performer who assists at, the actress's sacrifice, to whatever it may amount, of social respect. Thus the stage is entitled to say to society, 'You exact this work from us, and hold us cheap for doing it. You are bound then to protect the weaker members of our craft against the terrible risks which they often run for your sake. Your duty does not end with payment at the doors or applause, however judicious, in the house. Your pride and self-love inflict a social disability; and such disparagement ever tends to depress the moral status of those who incur it. The imputation which you freely fling on us ever tends to realise itself in actual profligacy. A profession which stands at a disadvantage in the eyes of public opinion, however unjustly, is only too likely to deserve that of which it is suspected; for the sense of hopeless injustice is apt to sting its more sensitive and impulsive members to desperation. Therefore, as you open the door to disparagement, you are bound by moral reciprocity to guard the opening, and keep it from becoming, by a natural and general law, a downward slope to social perdition.' We do not see how it is possible to set aside this claim. The 'Church and Stage Guild' is an attempt to recognise and meet it. It is only possible to overcome evil by good; and, omitting from our present view any specially religious agencies which that Guild may enlist, so far as it embodies that broad moral principle, we cannot but wish it well. For the amusers and the amused to have opportunities of meeting, knowing, and befriending one another, will minimise the chances of any of the former dropping into the gulf; while the latter will perhaps be astonished at the amount of self-respect, unimpaired in the face of social discouragement, which the ranks

of the former have to show. The perilous position of virtue on a slack-rope may gain a less slippery balance under the influence of women of unassailable reputation, by however many degrees of social latitude removed. Sympathy and kindly feeling may go far to outweigh baser temptations and less honourable influences. Society owes protection to women in proportion to the terrible temptations which it forces upon them. One cannot but hope that this Guild, or a similar agency, may hold out a helping hand on the perilous path, where the false step which ruins is but a hair's-breadth from the true track. We remember to have heard that an accomplished lady, now no more, was moved by her admiration for Mlle. Desclée, the French actress, then in London, to call upon her. Such an incident had never occurred to Desclée before in the course of her existence. She was extremely touched by it, and after having received her visitor with every mark of respect, she said to her, as they parted, 'Voudriez-vous me permettre, Mademoiselle, de vous embrasser?' She felt, perhaps for the first time, the sisterhood of human kindness.

Some remarks on the specialties of the ballet seem suggested by the above considerations. Every ballet is practically a *double entendre*, and the same is true of the many scenic diversions which rely more or less upon its aid. It is true on the one hand that they array in brightness, movement, life, and sparkle of light and colour, the richest treasures of poet's and artist's imagination. What art can elsewhere achieve only in an immoveable moment, lives before the eye through all its changeful phases of motion in the mimetic dance. This is artistically its object. But on the other hand the means which it uses appeal with equal force to a baser animalism and pamper the carrion-birds of appetite. There are paintings, and probably sculptures too, which are open to the same charge. But they are dead canvas and marble, and stand fixed changelessly before the eye. If they are public property, they hang or stand side by side with others of a neutral kind, and do not concentrate themselves in the public eye upon a stage given up to them for the time as its chief attraction, nor make the hoardings of London hideous by the Brobdingnagian picturesque of their illustrative placards. This *équivoque* with which we charge the ballet is understated by Miss Dietz in her pamphlet on 'The Work of the Actor,' when she says: 'The unimaginative person sees in the ballet only a number of half-dressed women jumping about in a ridiculous manner; another person sees the fairie creatures of the hidden world, light, airy, almost flying,' &c. What

then does the spectator more sensuous than imaginative see in the same? We should answer the question by merely writing a more coarse-flavoured adjective instead of 'ridiculous' in the above passage. The same lady-advocate pursues her theme: 'You honour your soldiers for the sake of their patriotism, because they risk their lives for their country; you honour your sailors who,' &c., &c. (a rather long list of honourables here follows) . . . 'but a woman who risks her good name to follow a noble art and earn an honest living, this woman you do not honour. Is not this feeling a relic of barbarism?' But as regards 'the woman who risks her good name,' need we quote Othello, or urge how far more intensely true, if true at all, his words are of the 'good name' of woman than of man? Is there not a suspicion of runaway morals in a votary of art who has gone ahead so fast as to find 'her good name' an incumbrance in the race?

Perhaps burlesque in some of its various forms is even more 'advanced' than the ballet. As Falstaff's sack was to Falstaff's bread, so are the superfluities of female toilet to its one necessary. Thus women are hired to become the physical vehicles of æsthetic culture, or rather stage machines of the graces of movement, attitude, and manner. The consciousness of this, were the character of the movements ever so immaculate and the incidental exposure ever so limited, must remove a weight from the scale of self-respect. It is not as in tragedy, comedy, or even possibly farce, where there is a character to sustain which has an ethical ingredient, which rouses the play of feeling while it animates the intellect. In the lowest of these, so long as vice is not directly suggested by the action as a whole, there is a glimpse of a nobler sphere, a possibility of higher touches. Art may here draw out the elements of the entire nature, the loftier elements tempering the lower and repressing their undue development; for here we take the actor or actress as a whole. In the ballet and kindred performances the display of an elegant *physique* in all its variations and combinations is the foremost, if not the sole aim; and the consciousness of this is to the female sex probably more prejudicial than the profession and practice of a prize-fighter to the male. The result of his or her art on the performer is not only direct, but curiously multiplied by what we may call the theatrical consciousness. For the stage performer the audience concentrates, as in the focus of a mirror, all the qualities, moral, intellectual, and physical, of his part, and reflects them back to him. But in the ballet, where the physical so largely predominate as to efface the rest, there is a

general public consciousness, inseparable even from its most æsthetic votaries, of the lower note struck as well as the higher, and prolonged when the higher ceases to vibrate. That rival element included in the *équivoque* of art, side by side with the living poetry of the ballet and all its picturesque and statuesque attributes, is multiplied, concentrated, and reflected back on the performer in a vastly greater ratio.

The same prince of poets who has said, 'Frailty, thy name 'is woman,' tells us also 'Men's vows are women's traitors,' and both axioms are signally illustrated by the biographies of that profession which he adorned while living, and which his genius feeds for all time. There have indeed always been those who have ennobled their art by their characters. But to skip such spotted names as Nell Gwynne and Peg Woffington, who, however, hardly scandalised by their effrontery the brazen ages in which they flourished, what an array of brilliancy besmirched and blighted do the annals of the stage reveal! The more terrible the odds against poor weak womanhood, the more unmeasurable, nay, inconceivable, they are to those who are shielded alike by tradition and position from them. Who indeed can rightly gauge the temptations of these heroines of the *chronique scandaleuse*? Who can understand and allow for the overpowering fascination which besets her who fascinates all? The test of a chronometer is to hurry it from a frozen to a boiling temperature. Similar is the ordeal to which an actress has often been exposed. The woman, or mere girl, emerges from the ice-house of penury and privation, and finds the world blazing with homage at her feet in the course of a season or less; fortified by no strength of education or sanctity of home, no cultured self-respect or holdfast of religious principle. To mark rich and titled fops paying court by scores, and the parasite fools of fashion following suit by thousands; to know that the Comus-rout of rakes, bibulous and libidinous, are wagering her overthrow, bribing her infamy, scheming her degradation, sullyng her fair fame in their foul calumnies and hunting her modesty to the death; or to be dogged at her lodgings, whispered at the stage door, ogled from the stage-box, by some prince of fashion with a cankered heart; to be plied by his missives, waylaid by his toadies, angled for by his panders, advertised in transparent asterisks by his agents in the press; to be pursued, invited, fêted, flattered, and to know that a single word or look would make her conqueress of the conqueror of society, yet to forbear to give it—yet to steel her constancy to confront with steadfast coldness the glow of

envenomed adulation—how turbid and terrible is the flood of such temptation! Some have found home itself tainted with an impure atmosphere, and read angry disappointment in a venal father's shrug, or found that a mother's heart has become the serpent's lair. How hard to brace the soul against the narcotics of evil counsel, when one finds vile suggestion everywhere and truth nowhere, when natural affection deserts to the enemy,

‘et peccare docentes
Fallax historias monet’!

Some again have married worthless ne'er-do-wells. Imagine a woman with a heart full of affection which she cannot bestow, mated with one who gambles away her earnings, ill-treats the wife by whose genius he pampers his own profligacy, and is brutally proud of using as a household chattel a creature who is the public cynosure of all eyes. How hard then to resist the temptation, from that giddy pinnacle of the temple of fame to dash at once by a single downward plunge, and snap the tie, and end the struggle! Who can wonder that so many careers have proved as brittle as they were brilliant? The wonder rather is that the number is so great of those who have shone with unassuming modesty, or dazzled with spotless splendour of renown; that so many emerge from that stress of temptation serenely and worshipfully pure.

An actor's career is an eccentric curve to which all things great and small, all personages high and low, may form tangents. All have their charm, and no two charm alike. The play of light and shadow, the sparkle of contrasts which they exhibit, is inexhaustible. Few of their admirers know how dear the admiration costs. For a foremost actor in a first-rate part, often indeed for one far less prominent, there is positively no substitute possible, if through any infirmity of our common nature he or she breaks down at the moment. Hence the desperate struggles to overcome such weakness, the strong temptations to stimulants in support of it, the dire tendency to cling to the stimulant for its own sake afterwards, the numerous sudden deaths either on the stage or at or near the theatre door, which such a chronicle includes. Few, again, can estimate how terribly seductive is the intoxication of success—the *Io triumphe* floating on ‘that sea of upturned faces in the pit,’ to which Mrs. Siddons declared human life had nothing comparable. Grandest at the moment, fullest of fascination, most transeendently triumphant of all the arts during its acme of an instant, the histrionic is the

most evanescent. Hence the temptation, often overwhelming, to live for the hour and let the future take its chance. Hence, too, it follows that the reigning favourite of to-day can never really be compared with his or her predecessors. The records of public triumphs are most fallacious relatively, whatever their absolute value. For the departed actor, *stat magni nominis umbra*, there remains a general light of tradition only, the blaze of a conflagration in the sky, the embers of which are below the horizon. With the generation in whose living applause they lived the great masters of public emotion die silently away. Their memory lives only in a dead faggot of anecdotes. We read the record of their flashing out from obscurity, passing in a week from the units column to the hundreds; sometimes, like Rachel, 'coining their heart and 'dropping their blood for drachmas,' sometimes, like Kean, living only for fame and chiefly on brandy. We have many a thrilling tale how they enchained their audience to a silence fearful of its own applause; but of the analysis of that fascination we can learn only the vaguest generalities; all the bright peculiar difference which specialised the charm to the eye and ear of its own day is dead and gone with it. There is no spectroscope of memory for the star that has for ever set.

We will conclude with a characteristic anecdote that needs no comment. 'Asseyez-vous, Mademoiselle,' said the Emperor Nicholas to Rachel, after she had thrown several crowned heads and a crowd of serene highnesses into ecstacy at Potsdam. She had risen to meet the great Czar, one of the most imperial and chivalresque figures that ever wore an order; but he declined the homage, he came to pay it:— 'Asseyez-vous,' he said; 'les royautés ecmme la mienne passent, 'la royauté de l'art ne passe pas.' This from him 'of all the 'Russias' to her, the little Jewess girl, who had risen to the highest from the lowest round of the histrionic ladder, as a singer for stray *sous* at a *café chantant* in Paris! The royalty of art, it is true, departs not; though its individual kings and queens, 'like chimney-sweepers, come to dust.'

ART. III.—*Atti della Giunta per la Inchiesta Agraria e sulle Condizioni della Classe Agricola.* Rome: 1881-2.

NEVER since the dawn of history was there a time when so much and such sedulous care and thought were given to the condition and wants of the poor, by the ruling and more fortunate classes of society in all civilised communities, as is the case at present. It would be cynically unjust, and inconsistent with palpable facts, to maintain that this is due wholly, or even mainly, to fear of what may result from the desperation of the miserable and the teaching of *malesuada* fables. But, on the other hand, warnings of a very significant kind which address themselves as imperatively to the statesman as to the philanthropist are from day to day making themselves heard and seen in every country of Europe. In none has the need of amelioration been greater than in Italy; while the warnings of the kind alluded to have been less seriously menacing there than elsewhere. It is the more creditable, therefore, to that nation that she has earnestly taken in hand the task of alleviating the condition of her least fortunate classes, not constrained by fear of any imminent social catastrophe, but moved by considerations of a worthier order. It is true that *doctrinaire* republicans and hot-headed socialists have of late found means to make their voices more loudly heard in Northern Italy, and have in some degree disquieted ministers by their violence. But these demonstrations of the revolutionary party in Italy, which we regard as virtually absorbed by the independence of the nation and the popularity of the reigning family, have little or no connexion with the real sores and plague-spots of the country, and certainly do not draw whatever force they may possess from any upheaval of the really lowest strata of the body social.

The true warnings which in Italy have forced themselves on the attention of statesmen, economists, and philanthropists, have been of a dumb nature. That is to say, they have hitherto been seen rather than heard. It has been the object of the writers and compilers of the series of reports mentioned at the head of this article to give them an articulate and audible voice. Among those whose persistent endeavours succeeded, in March 1877, in inducing the Italian Parliament to institute a commission of enquiry into the condition of the agricultural classes, Dr. Agostino Bertani was the foremost. The republican principles which that gentleman has consistently professed during a long life have inevitably rendered

him less useful to his country than he might otherwise have been. But his high and unblemished character and well-known philanthropy ensured his being placed on the commission by men who in no wise share his political opinions. The Senator, Count Stefano Jacini, who accepted the presidency of it, is well known to be one of the ablest and most thoroughly competent agronomists in the kingdom, and is perhaps the highest extant authority upon all questions connected with Italian agriculture. The law under which the commission was named provided that the number of the commissioners should be twelve: four to be appointed by the Senate, four by the Chamber of Deputies, and four by the Government, who were also members of the Italian Parliament. The composition of this body has been a good deal criticised, and it has been thought that more would have been effected if the enquiry had been conducted by experts working on the spot and actually visiting the various parts of the Peninsula.

‘For,’ says Count Jacini, ‘the phenomena of rural economy have in every district a special and characteristic physiognomy of their own, the result of a thousand different circumstances. And these easily deceive the judgment even of a practised agriculturist, if he be deficient in experience of that special locality to which his enquiries are directed. Nor is a true judgment of the circumstances really formed by means of the fugitive visit of a commission. The phenomena in question cannot be rightly understood without a prolonged sojourn in the locality to be examined. There is nothing which more completely evades all *veni, vidi, vici* processes, than the agrarian organisation of any given district, or which more readily mystifies anyone who attempts to discover its secrets without sufficient initiation.’

In point of fact the enquiry was conducted by a scheme of questions addressed to the local authorities. By means of these returns and by the work of the commissioners, a vast mass of valuable, perfectly new, and highly interesting information has been accumulated on a subject which Senator Jacini speaks of as a *terra incognita*—the agricultural life and conditions of Italy. But it must be added that this accumulation of materials is still singularly deficient in method and perspicuity. The instructions of the commissioners were naturally carried out in different ways by different local officers, some of whom were very able and some very ignorant; and the whole report wants uniformity and compression. A somewhat similar charge has been brought against the Agricultural Commission recently appointed in this country. It is curious to compare enquiries of a similar nature conducted in countries differing so widely as Italy and Great Britain; and we may

say at once that whatever be the complaints and grievances of British landlords, farmers, and labourers, they are living in a condition infinitely superior to that of the rural population of the brightest of lands and the most fertile of soils.

The objects of the enquiry were defined to be threefold: 1. The existing condition of agriculture; 2. The condition of the proprietors of the soil; 3. The condition of the tillers of it. And the list of questions prepared was divided into the following six groups:

1. Physical conditions of the soil and climate in each of the twelve districts into which the country was divided for the purposes of the enquiry.

2. Population and its distribution; proportion between urban and rural populations; greater or less degree of agglomeration; distance of peasants' dwellings from their work.

3. Agriculture in the more restricted sense of the term; the various agricultural industries and the objects of them. This chapter, by far the most extensive and largely treated, is divided into a considerable number of sections treating of every portion of rural economy—objects of culture; methods of culture; cattle-breeding; maladies to which animals and plants are subject; rotation of crops, and the influence of irrigation on it; quantity of labour employed; abundance or scarcity of labour in different districts; hydraulic improvements; manure; gross and net produce of the soil; banking assistance to the peasantry; roads, imperial, provincial, communal or private, &c.

4. Conditions under which the land is held; proportions of large, middling, small, and very small proprietors; as also of land held by bodies corporate.

5. Relations existing between the landowners and the tillers of the soil (the subjects treated under this heading refer exclusively to the legal and business relations between the parties); nature of leases; terms on which proprietors cultivating their own land employ labour; greater or less prevalence of sub-letting; the *mezzadria* or *conacre* system, and the like.

6. The physical, moral, intellectual, and economical condition of the labouring population.

Under this head the questions are shaped with a view to ascertain the customs and modes of living of the various classes of labourers in the different districts, with the changes which have recently taken place in the same, and the causes of these changes. They embrace almost every conceivable detail of the peasant's life; as food, clothing, habitation; home and

family life and the traditions which govern it; general sanitary conditions; periods of labour; labour of women and children; longevity; mortality of infants; maladies prevalent among the rural populations, as pellagra, intermittent fever, &c.; education; influence of the conscription; emigration and its causes; and innumerable other facts bearing on the moral and physical condition of the masses of agricultural labourers.

Now, of the six divisions of the subject to which the list of questions has been adapted, it is clear that this last is the one most calculated to interest a foreigner. And it will be admitted that the list of subjects thus set forth is of a nature to stimulate curiosity in no ordinary degree, and holds out the promise of a complete acquaintance with the whole life and character of the Italian agricultural population.

Answers to certain strings of questions have been obtained from all, or nearly all, the syndics in a district by some of the more active and zealous commissioners. For instance, the question, 'What is the condition of the dwellings of the agricultural population in your commune?' is sent to the syndic of every commune in a district, and a variety of answers is received, wherein the changes are rung on such phrases as 'Sufficient;' 'Indifferent;' 'Leave much to be desired;' 'Dogholes;' 'Not fit for cattle, much less for Christians;' 'Fairly decent;' 'Middling;' 'Very bad;' &c. These replies are given by men of such average intelligence as the syndic of a rural commune may be expected to be; but it is evident that the value of the expressions used in each instance could only be estimated by means of a competent knowledge of the man who uses them, his political and social ideas, prejudices, and opinions.

We propose to take Signor Morpurgo's report on the conditions of the rural population of Venetia, including the provinces of Verona, Vicenza, Padua, Rovigo, Venice, Treviso, Belluno, and Udine, as a specimen of the results obtained by the enquiry. We have selected this report, both because it has the reputation of being exceptionally well done, and because the district in question is a very interesting one, and one with which a large number of English travellers are acquainted.

Signor Morpurgo begins his task by an enquiry into the condition of the habitations of the rural labouring population. 'If it be true,' he says, 'that the dwelling is the most infallible index to the condition of the family which inhabits it, truly the state of the labouring population in the districts of Venetia must be painted in very dark colours indeed.' This

general opinion is the result of the answers obtained to a number of questions bearing on the condition of the peasants' dwellings; the cause of its badness, if it be bad; and the practicability of ameliorating it. This catechism might easily have been made more exhaustive, and above all better calculated to elicit replies containing concrete facts, and less characterised by a tendency to general description. But such as the questions are, the answers to them would have furnished a very fairly sufficient knowledge of the subject—if they had been answered. But if any single syndie in all the large extent of territory with which Signor Morpurgo's enquiries were concerned supplied him with replies to the above-mentioned series of questions, he has not printed them. The syndics, and in many instances the Communal Chamber to whom questions were addressed, seem to have acted under the same impulse of individualism as impelled the twelve commissioners to set about their work each after his own fashion. They content themselves, for the most part, with giving answers of a generally descriptive character.

Signor Morpurgo begins with the province of Belluno. It is in great part a mountain district; and those who have visited its capital, Belluno, will not have forgotten the beautiful position of the city, with its amphitheatre of mountains. Many of our travelling fellow-countrymen have seen it, for it is at no great distance from the neighbourhood of Pieve de Cadore, which Titian and the Dolomites have made a favourite place of pilgrimage. It may be mentioned here, although it belongs to a different section of Signor Morpurgo's report, that the account given of the moral condition of the population in this province is particularly good. Almost without exception throughout Northern and Middle Italy, the moral condition of the mountain districts is represented to be far superior to that prevailing in the plains; and the province of Belluno, even among such districts, seems to be *facile princeps*. The syndie of Auronzo (province of Belluno) writes that 'the satisfactory moral condition of the peasants in those regions is due to the influence of sound religious ideas, to the simplicity of their mode of life, to their love of labour, and to qualities of integrity which may be said to be traditional among them.' In another place in the same region we hear of scrupulous and all but universal honesty, amid extreme misery and destitution.

There does not appear to be any ground for supposing that the moral superiority of the mountain districts is at all connected with a higher degree of prosperity and well-being. On

the contrary, with the exception of certain specially low-lying districts, the mountain populations are everywhere represented as poorer than their neighbours of the plain. Everywhere throughout the beautiful mountains inhabited by this virtuous peasantry, the statements respecting their dwellings are most lamentable. From one commune after another come the phrases, 'Intolerable;' 'Dens of infection;' 'Hovels unfit for human habitation;' and the like. 'They are very small, badly repaired, badly ventilated, badly built, neither floored nor paved, thatched with straw, and overerowed; very generally damp, low, dark, and with dunghills in immediate contiguity to them.'

Those who inhabit these houses, we are told, are almost always the owners of them. In rare cases they are let, at the rate of five francs yearly for each room. 'But this name of owner scarcely ever signifies any of the comforts of ownership. Poverty makes it impossible for the proprietor to do anything towards keeping up these houses, which are often in a ruinous condition.' In some instances communes which possess woods give assistance to the poverty-stricken house-owners for the execution of urgently needed repairs. Property, it is to be observed, is much subdivided in these mountain districts; and it is very noteworthy that matters appear to become worse in proportion to the smallness of the holdings.

It is also very remarkable that in the replies sent from the different communes there is a constantly recurring complaint of *deterioration*; and this not only in the mountain districts, or with regard to the dwellings of the labouring classes, but generally, and with reference to their condition in all respects. Things, it is said, are much worse than they used to be. The syndic of a commune adjacent to Cividale, in the province of Udine, speaks of his village as having been 'a smiling suburb in days gone by, but now marked with misery in every line of its aspect.'

'If a clear proof were sought of the change that is taking place in the peasant life of our day, it might be found in the altered domestic habits. But a few years ago the strength of the family tie was the boast of nearly the whole of this region. The families were numerous, closely bound together, and unanimous in the respect and obedience paid to the oldest member of the household. The habits of these families were the very type of those described by the expressive word *patriarchal*. They were the last survivors of a state of society which has disappeared, or is on the point of disappearing. They may still be found here and there, precious relics of a past state of things, but solely in the Alpine region.

'Economic distress rapidly brings to an end the cohesion of such

families, and the multiplication of children in the recent marriages' (we here translate word for word) 'renders it impossible. The cottage becomes too small, the land gives forth the poorest nutriment yet more grudgingly than before, and there is no escape from the fate of emigration.'

It must be remembered that no poor law exists in Italy; though that has occurred there which first necessitated the enactment of a poor law in England—the abolition of the monasteries. It is undeniable that the unfailing dole at the convent gate tended, if not to create, at least to perpetuate a pauperised condition and a pauper class. Nevertheless, the existence of a something which served as a buffer between extreme distress and the last extremity of absolute starvation must have produced a difference of condition between the old time and the new, which needs to be largely taken into account in any comparison of the two.

It is singular that Signor Morpurgo, in assigning reasons why that patriarchal *régime* which was possible formerly should be so no longer, adduces the multiplication of children *nei nuovi connubii*—in the new marriages. Does he mean, one is obliged to ask, that the population of the districts in question is increasing at a more rapid rate than heretofore? If so, the subject is so large and important a branch of his enquiry, that it would seem impossible for him not to have given some further attention to it. But he says no other word on the subject. Very noteworthy, too, is his statement as to the diminished fertility of the land. Of this, however, he does give some explanation in another part of the work, referring it to the increased poverty of the small owner, whose means no longer permit him to expend any money on manure.

The 'emigration' above alluded to must be understood to mean merely that practice familiar to us in the case of the Irish rural populations—namely, the quitting of house and family for a few months in search of work and bread not to be found at home. In other parts of Italy, more especially in the south, emigration in the larger sense of the word is common enough. But these mountaineers 'desert their homes for a time in order to feed by their savings those who remain behind.' It is not properly emigration, but migration in search of work, which is a very different thing. In this sense much of the Italian population is very migratory. For example, the mines in Sardinia are worked by troops of immigrants from Northern Italy, who quit the island and return home in the unhealthy season. It is important to observe, however, that the uniform testimony of the reports

shows a marked deterioration in the morality of the emigrants to result from these temporary migrations.

‘The temporary emigrant leaves his home for the sake of finding bread for those who remain in it. This, at least, is the intention of those who quit their native place. But these virtuous purposes become weakened, or, not unfrequently, altogether forgotten. Distance and freedom from home ties influence the habits even in the best cases. Single men prefer to form homes for themselves, and to separate themselves from the old people. Husbands lay the burden of the hardest work on the poor wives, even during the periods of their sojourn at home after their return from emigration.’

The reporter, in considering the moral condition of the populations, returns again and again to the modern tendency towards the disintegration of families. And this is remarkable as indicating the difference between the standpoints of an Italian and an English observer of these phenomena. The latter would hardly see any evil in the inclination of young men to leave the paternal roof and seek work and a home on their own account. But this anti-patriarchal tendency is evidently considered by Signor Morpurgo as one of the worst symptoms of the time. Nor is this to be explained by attributing to the reporter old-world preferences and the prejudices of a *laudator temporis acti*. Signor Morpurgo is a liberal of the liberals.

The existence of strong family affection is unquestionably at once an evidence and a safeguard of morality. But it seems strange to English ideas to find, in place of any statistical account of crime and legal offences, mere general lamentations over the decay of the family tie. Signor Morpurgo quotes the following remarks from the communications of a person whom he states to be a very high authority on the subject:—

‘Generally the sons who marry remain in the home of the father; but the women are less content with that arrangement than they used formerly to be. Quarrels and differences on questions of interest arise, and a tendency towards division, and the desire of each family to live by itself, is frequently manifested. The head of the family has less authority than he used to have. The grown-up members of the family are often disposed to call on him for his accounts, and pass from criticising to censure and discontent. Where the family tie remains unbroken, the family is better off, and the soil is better cultivated. A good practical means for preventing the weakening of the family tie is for the master to recognise only the head of the family, and the immediate expulsion of any member of it who creates discord.’

It appears from the above passage that the writer is no

VOL. CLVIII. NO. CCCXXIII. II

longer considering the mountain districts, where almost every head of a family is the owner of his habitation and patch of land, but has descended to the plains, where the properties are for the most part larger. But there is a degree of simplicity, and almost childishness, about the tone of the above remarks, which is not reassuring as to the writer's capacity for estimating and dealing with social problems. It is very difficult to believe that such composite families as he speaks of could have lived without dissensions on points of interest in times recently gone by. If married sons remain in the house of the father—houses which we are told are almost invariably insufficient, small, and miserable—as it seems to be considered so desirable they should do, it is at all events clear that the children of those married sons must have to find some other shelter. That the land (i.e. the same extent of land, which is what is meant) should be better cultivated by a more numerous body of cultivators is natural enough. But it is scarcely probable that if adult young men are discontented with the division of the remuneration for the family labour, they would consent to work for a master who should deal for their services solely with their father.

Signor Morpurgo reports that it is extremely difficult to obtain trustworthy information respecting the religious condition of the population. The great majority of the answers elicited by his enquiries point to a general diminution of religious faith. In the mountain districts, where religious feeling used to be strongest, this decay is attributed to the practice of temporary emigration which has been spoken of. It is remarked that the fervent observance of forms, where it exists, takes the place of any active and lively spiritual faith. But it does not appear to have occurred to the reporter that the remark is one of somewhat wider application than to the labouring population of Venetia. One observation which he places on record is curious, to the effect, namely, that whereas religious sentiment is stronger in the province of Vicenza than in that of Venice, the exact contrary is the case as regards superstitious beliefs.

With the exception of a few communes here and there, the reports as to the sexual morality of the rural populations are decidedly favourable. An undeniable proof of the accuracy of these statements, says Signor Morpurgo, may be found in the statistical returns of illegitimate births, which are very satisfactory, even although it is to be observed that all the children of parents married by the religious rite alone, unaccompanied by the civil form, are registered as illegitimate.

The reports as to offences against the person and against property are less favourable. The first general statement on the subject is that theft increases in proportion to the distance from the mountain districts; and this assertion Signor Morpurgo declares to be incontrovertible.

‘It is perfectly true,’ he writes, ‘that respect for property is proverbial in the mountain districts of the Venetian provinces. The province of Belluno, above all others, is unrivalled in its habits of honesty. These habits are there instinctive. They are learned in the practice of home life; they are perpetuated by a force of public opinion which changed times have not weakened; and they are not lost even among the demoralising novelties of temporary emigration. The life of these mountaineers is indubitably full of privations. But for all that, the temptation of laying their hands on the property of others does not master them. Good traditions, the small difference existing between one man’s fortune and another’s, the intimate and cordial relations between neighbours of every class, the religious sentiment which survives there in greater purity, the more laborious life, the wider distance and more entire separation from any town, all contribute to keep these excellent people in the right way. But to these causes may be added another, the influence of which is certainly not inferior to that of any of them. In the hill country the poor man and the proprietor are not distinguished from each other in the common parlance of the people. The property possessed by any one of them is but a very small matter in money value, but it represents an infinite amount of patient labour. Every man is strongly impressed with the meaning of the word *mine*. . . . The orderly and well-balanced social arrangements are owing principally to the universal poverty. I assert the fact,’ says Signor Morpurgo, ‘but I leave all discussion respecting its explanation to the moralist and the economist. It is sufficient for me to point out the fact, equally undeniable, that the family relations are in these districts very much better than in other regions. No sooner does the inequality between man and man become more marked, no sooner does the difference of condition assume a permanent form, and create classes of proprietors, farmers, and labourers, than the good state of morality disappears. Rural theft at once makes its appearance.’

It may be remarked here that Signor Morpurgo would have recorded this phenomenon more philosophically if, instead of asserting that ‘the well-balanced and orderly social arrangements are owing principally to the universal poverty,’ he had simply stated that honesty and poverty are, in this region, contemporaneous and co-extensive—which is, in fact, all that his report can be taken to prove. Further on he says: ‘All the eastern and southern part of the Venetian provinces’ (that is to say, those portions of them situated in the plain) ‘may, without hesitation, be declared to be the home of rural theft. In the province of Rovigo it is deemed almost per-

‘missible. In the province of Padua the crops in the fields are continually menaced even by persons who are not poor.’ And we are told that generally throughout Venetia, with the exception of a few communes, private property is exposed to depredation not only from hired labourers, but from persons belonging to the class of small farmers.

As regards crime against the person, all the Venetian provinces stand well in comparison with other parts of Italy. For the years from 1866 to 1877, the average annual number of homicides in these provinces was sixteen per million of inhabitants. In Liguria, which is the district next most favourably circumstanced in this respect, there were during the same period twenty-five homicides per million inhabitants. And in Latium, which is the worst part of Italy in this respect, there was during the years 1872–77 an annual average of one hundred and thirty-five homicides per million inhabitants. The cause of crimes of violence in the Venetian provinces is almost always either drunkenness or jealousy.

In a succeeding section Signor Morpurgo sets himself to enquire into the relations (not legal, but social) existing between the tillers and the owners of the soil. His special aim, he says, was to obtain replies to the question thus formulated: ‘What opinion do the labourers of the poorest class appear to have formed respecting the right of property in land?’ And he remarks that ‘public opinion on this point manifests itself in various ways. It cannot hide itself. A person with his eyes open, and who is not an interested party in the quarrels between landowners and labourers, will scarcely err in the formation of his own judgment on the subject.’

Signor Morpurgo may be right in thinking that a competent observer, living among the people respecting whom he desires to be informed, could scarcely be deceived on this subject. But the answers to his question which he publishes in the report are in the highest degree fragmentary and inconclusive. Indeed they serve little purpose save to show that such an enquiry could only be efficiently carried out by the personal investigations of one and the same individual, extending over the whole district under examination.

A detailed account of the replies received from different communes and districts would be wholly useless and uninteresting. They differ so apparently capriciously as to lead to the conclusion that the tenor of them depends, in the main, on the character of the landowner. Signor Morpurgo begins this part of his subject by stating that the province of Belluno offers no field for the study of the relations between labourers

and landowners. The extreme smallness of the properties, and the small number of labourers employed from day to day (*contadini avventizii*, as they are called, to distinguish them from those hired by the year), exclude all question of class feeling between employers and employed. They are all poor people, and all more or less labourers together.

The relations between the owners and tillers of the soil are very powerfully and favourably modified by the existence of the *mezzadria*, wherever it prevails, as it does sporadically over parts of this region. *Mezzadria* is an arrangement which consists in placing a family of cultivators in possession of a farm, on condition that part of the produce in kind shall be given to the landlord. It is, in fact, nearly the same thing as the *métayer* system in France. The farms under this system are small, being such as one family of peasants may be able to cultivate. In many cases where the soil is poor, especially in the more hilly parts of the country, the traditional custom is that one-third only of the produce shall be the property of the landlord. There exist a number of rules and traditions, all perfectly well known and recognised, which, in some degree, modify the great outlines of the contract as above stated. But these are in many respects so intricate that an explanation of them would draw too largely on our space. For example, the digging of new trenches for the planting of vines, if it becomes necessary to renew the vineyard, is to be done at the expense of the landlord. If the peasant family is obliged for this purpose to call in the assistance of hired labour, this is charged to the 'master'—the *padrone*, as he is always called. If it is necessary to purchase a new yoke of oxen, this also has to be done by the landowner. Further, it may be remarked that the intercourse between landowner and peasant in the case of the *mezzadria* is almost always of an easy-going nature. It is tempered, for the most part, by a certain give-and-take laxity, which tends to the promotion of good feeling on both sides, but is in the long run, and in solid profit, much to the advantage of the peasant. For instance, very few *padroni* would expect to find any mention in the yearly accounts of so small a matter as a few barndoor fowls or turkeys. Yet of course the quantity of grain to be divided between the parties is diminished by feeding the poultry. On the other hand, no *padrone* residing in the villa to which the *podere*, or farm, is attached, would scruple to pluck from the vines as many grapes as he needed for his own table; nor would the peasant think of taking it amiss. Again, in more serious matters, the

practice is so far patriarchal, that no proprietor would dream of expelling a family from a farm because in consequence of a bad year they had eaten the grain instead of reserving half of it for him. The *contadino* and his family must live; and this necessity admittedly takes precedence of the necessity to give the landlord half the produce.

In a word, there is not the smallest doubt that the *mezzadria* system is productive of a better tone of feeling between the owner and the cultivator of the soil than any other. It is also very favourable to the well-being of the peasant class. None of the extreme poverty and misery which the reports before us show to be so prevalent in other regions, is to be found where the *mezzadria* exists. It is evident, moreover, that under this system a numerous family is a source of prosperity and not of difficulty to the peasant. The farms, as has been said, are of an extent deemed sufficient for the maintenance of a family, and of course requiring the labour of a family for their due cultivation. Where the soil is good, and where there are facilities for a market, a peasant family is comfortably off with half a dozen adult sons, and would be far poorer with only one or two. The tie formed by this system between landlord and peasant is so strong, and so mutually favourable, that we have ourselves known cases where the same family has been on the same land for over three hundred years.

On the other hand it is asserted, and we think no doubt correctly, that cultivation under the *mezzadria* system is not calculated to obtain from the soil all that it might be made to produce; that the peasant cultivators of farms only large enough to support one family are almost invariably opposed to innovation on their immemorial practice; and that they have neither the intelligence nor the means needed for availing themselves of the results of modern science. But it may also be stated more generally, judging from the testimony of these reports, that small farms are always less productive, acre for acre, than large ones. Whether the soil be divided into very small holdings in the hands of almost pauper proprietors, or whether, as in the districts where the *mezzadria* prevails, the farms are cultivated by a single family, the result is the same—imperfect and inefficient agriculture. And the distressing feature of the matter is, that economic failure and social success seem to be indissolubly allied. It is from mountainous districts, inhabited by a race of miserably poor proprietors, that we hear of theft being unknown among them; and in regions where the *mezzadria* produces a class of by no means miserably poor but ignorant, prejudiced, and unimproving peasants,

we are told that theft is exceedingly rare, while from the districts of large farms, cultivated by labourers hired from year to year and by day labourers, we hear of habitual thievery. It is the same as regards subversive ideas respecting property. The reports of enmity between class and class, and of hostility towards property, come from the plains, and from the regions of large farms.

There is one exception to the general poverty and misery of the small proprietors recorded by Signor Morpurgo. It occurs in the islands of the Venetian lagoon, especially in Burano and Murano. These islands are inhabited mainly by a race of gardeners who in Murano cultivate their own small properties, and in Burano work on the *mezzadria* system. The reporter says that these people are 'comfortably off, wonderfully industrious, and exemplary in thrift and economy.' But it is to be observed that, by the nature of their occupation and the circumstances of the case, these gardeners, with the market of Venice at their doors, are too exceptionally situated to be taken as examples of the general condition of agriculture.

We have adverted to the extraordinary variety of the answers given to the reporter's enquiries as to the prevalent ideas of the peasantry regarding the rights of property in the soil. He appears to have been struck himself by their apparent inconsistency, and in summing up he reminds us that the information obtained can only be compared to a bird's-eye view over a wide landscape, and that nothing more can be looked for than a general average of impressions. But he declares that the impression thus obtained is by no means a favourable one. It is to be noted, however, that he does not attribute the uneasiness of the relations between property and labour to the prevalence of subversive theories or socialistic teaching, but simply to the miserable condition of the labourer.

'Both the prevailing ideas on this subject and the moral tone of the labouring classes generally,' he writes, 'are unfailing indications of the unsatisfactory economic conditions of the people. Wherever it is believed that these latter depend on the conduct or interest of another, it cannot be but that the social relations suffer. Whether researches on this subject be instituted by alarmists or by optimists, the conclusion they will equally arrive at will be that disparities of condition are at the present day more painfully felt in our rural districts than was formerly the case. Antagonisms are multiplied, and, however they may have been produced, assuredly create a state of things which merits the attention of the legislature.'

The reporter next proceeds to the consideration of a subject

which he says he approaches with misgiving, and almost with fear—the question, namely, whether the condition of the agricultural labouring classes has recently been improved or the reverse. This confession of the frame of mind in which he approaches the subject may be taken to be tolerably conclusive as to the result to which his enquiries have conducted him. For, putting aside the general and natural desire of every good citizen to find that the progress of his fellow-countrymen is an upward and hopeful one, the political faith of the reporter must be borne in mind. Terrible indeed would it be to an active soldier of that modern liberalism which has in Italy destroyed so many old things and substituted new things for them, were it proved to him that the political progress obtained by so much sacrifice has been contemporaneous with a progressive degradation and pauperisation of the largest class of the population.

‘Admitting,’ writes Signor Morpurgo, ‘that nothing within the last twenty years has changed the legal position of the classes in question, yet we have an indubitably ameliorated relationship between the subject and the government, improved means of communication, a more developed spirit of public charity, a greater diffusion of elementary instruction, and a less marked moral inferiority of the poor. And taking all this into consideration, I think the only credible and logical answer to the question I have proposed (namely, whether the condition of the agricultural population has recently been improved or the reverse) is to be found in the fact that, in the rural districts as in the cities, every man of whatever condition is more able to assert his rights in these days.’

This statement is no answer at all to the above question. But what Signor Morpurgo has in his mind is, probably, that political freedom and some increase of general instruction have made privations more keenly felt and more loudly lamented than was formerly the case. And this, no doubt, is true. But we are still as far as ever from having any trustworthy information on the vitally important point whether there is, or is not, deterioration in the material conditions of the peasantry.

There can be no doubt that the dread with which Signor Morpurgo describes himself as approaching the question of the peasants’ comparative well-being under the old *régime* and the new arises from his misgiving that he may be constrained to confess that all the political benefits which he enumerates have not produced the good effects which he would fain have believed them certain to produce. It might have been expected that the good results would follow.

‘But,’ writes the reporter, ‘whoever gives ear to the voices of warning and lamentation to be heard on all sides, whoever pauses to con-

sider certain significant and indubitable facts—such as the rapid and menacing increase of the *pellagra*, of emigration, and of mendicity—is justified in asserting *primâ facie*, and without need of patient and minute enquiries, that the facts of the case are not in accordance with this expectation. The lamentations in the great majority of districts are so unanimous as to suggest but one answer to the question proposed—*The people are worse off almost everywhere!* It would seem that neither the diversity in the soil of different districts, nor the moral advantages of small holdings, nor the community of interests secured by the *mezzadria* system, nor the efforts of those proprietors who make a noble use of their position (and such are not wanting), nor the unceasing progress in the means of communication, have availed to stay the decadence which we hear of from every quarter.’

Here at last is an answer to Signor Morpurgo’s query. He somewhat qualifies this sweeping statement, however, by the following passage in the next page:—

‘ One sole province there is, in which the evidence, as regards by far the greater part of it, differs from that which comes from all the others. It is the province of Verona. There (with the exception of the immediate neighbourhood of the city and of the mountainous region to the north), from Peschiera to the great Veronese valley, over a region comprising every variety of soil, improved economic and sanitary conditions are declared to exist everywhere.’

This would be an exceedingly interesting and instructive statement if Signor Morpurgo had made any attempt to explain the causes of so remarkable a difference. But he gives us no suggestion on the subject; and, since it seems impossible to suppose that he failed to perceive the importance of such an opportunity for forming a theory as to the causes of the deterioration lamented in other quarters, we can only suppose that he was wholly at a loss to account for the phenomenon.

After giving various replies of communal authorities, almost invariably to the effect that the state of the agricultural population has deteriorated within the last twenty years, Signor Morpurgo places on record two replies from persons in a somewhat superior position.* These, he says, are calculated to guide the reader to a judgment as to the value of many of the testimonies he has already quoted. The first of them is from the prætor of a town called Barbarano, who writes:—

‘ It is not easy to reply to your question. The new men * allow of no doubt that the peasants are better off as regards clothing, means of communication, education, and some other matters. The old maintain that, though they are better dressed, and though out of doors—in the

* The political changes to which Italy has been subjected sufficiently explain the meaning of the prætor’s phrase.

streets and markets—they indulge themselves more, taking coffee, or a glass of beer or liquor, yet formerly they were better off, because in their homes there was greater plenty of things necessary for their families; neither work nor *polenta* was wanting, nor was anything seen of the *pellagra*.’

The prætor concludes that if the balance of improvement and deterioration be struck, it will be found to stand pretty much as follows: On the favourable side, augmentation of production; increase of wages; cheapness of clothing; facility of communication; greater diffusion of instruction. On the unfavourable side, augmentation of population; rise in the price of necessaries; increase of government taxes; increase of communal taxes; scarcity of work.

Now, supposing that the first two items in both these accounts—the increased production of the land and higher wages on the one hand, and increased population and higher price of necessaries on the other—may be assumed to balance each other, it is very clear that the remaining items must show a result greatly to the disadvantage of the peasant. The utmost conceivable diminution in the price of his simple clothing will go but a little way towards meeting the demands of the government tax collector; increased facility of locomotion will not help him towards paying the heavy demands of his own commune; and a wider diffusion of education will scarcely afford consolation for the difficulty of finding work. It is to be feared that the prætor of Barbarano is one of those ‘new men’ who think that all those theories as to the political regeneration of their country on which the efforts of their whole lives have been based, must necessarily be upset and abandoned if their realisation be proved contemporaneous with an increase in sundry evils. Those who think thus may probably be guilty of a *post hoc ergo propter hoc*.

The second response comes also from a prætor, him of Montagnana. The peasants, according to this gentleman, ‘live in vicissitudes between well and ill, between a debauch and a fast, between the delights of an orgy and lamentations over their misery, singing with contentment when their stomachs are full, vociferating imprecations against all who possess anything, and against the constituted order of society when they are fasting.’ He concludes that, taking everything into consideration, ‘the condition of the peasant, if it be not better than it was fifteen or twenty years ago, yet is not worse.’

Signor Morpurgo proceeds to consider at great length whether the all but universal complaints of the present time

as compared with the past may not contain much exaggeration, and how much weight should be given to the changed circumstances of life and the increased exigencies of the poor. He hesitates to pronounce absolutely either way. Nevertheless, with the exception of one statement, which taken by itself is perhaps the most valuable of all the facts adduced, the evidence greatly preponderates in favour of the truthfulness of the complaints. The one fact alluded to is, however, a strong one. If, says Signor Morpurgo, the deterioration were general, and so great as to assume the character of pauperism, such a state of things must necessarily be reflected in the diminished consumption of certain articles, as, for example, salt and tobacco. And this, he asserts, is shown by statistical returns not to be the case. It is to be observed, however, that as regards the first of these articles, consumption cannot be forced down below a certain point. And the recent agitation for the diminution of the tax on salt, together with the facts adduced and the arguments urged by those who have brought the question before the Chamber, would certainly seem to show that this lowest point has been reached. With respect to the consumption of tobacco, all the classes above the lowest certainly would consider it distinctly as a luxury. But those who are well acquainted with the habits of the Italian labouring classes will, we think, admit that the indulgence in a halfpenny cigar is no proof that the smoker has a sufficiency of food, even for the passing moment; and still less, unhappily, is it a proof that the smoker's wife and children have, not bread, but *polenta* enough to satisfy the cravings of hunger.

Signor Morpurgo, after conscientiously recording all the testimony which has reached him from the various communes respecting the condition of the rural poor, sums up the result of his information, somewhat to the reader's surprise, as follows: 'It must suffice for me to express the opinion that, despite the many evils which are proved beyond all doubt to exist, there is no ground for speaking of absolute and permanent deterioration, or of any really irreparable evils.'

Sad indeed would it be if we found ourselves compelled to face the prospect of 'irreparable' evils. Doubtless none of the evils lamented in these reports are irreparable. But in many districts the physical deterioration of the race is proved to be increasing, from the spread of *pellagra* and the lack of sufficient nutriment. And this is the case mainly in districts which are agriculturally the richest in the Peninsula. Those who are responsible for the government of the country should consider, with the deepest earnestness, that every year's delay

in the removal of these evils must retard, perhaps for decades, the final recovery of the country. Signor Morpurgo's desire to enquire conscientiously and report fairly is evident. Nevertheless his conclusion that no absolute deterioration exists, following upon the mass of testimony to the contrary, is startling. One cannot resist the fear that his passionate attachment to the political progress of Italy has rendered him unable to admit that this has been accompanied by social or economic deterioration. No doubt something must be allowed for the tendency of those who are suffering at the present moment to imagine that the old times were the good times. But it must be remembered that the answers embodying this nearly universal lamentation have not come from the sufferers themselves, but from their superiors in position and station. It is to be observed further, that in another chapter of his report which treats more especially of the rates of wages, the lamentable picture presented to us of the general state of rural economy includes not only the labouring class properly so called, but every class connected with agriculture.

A less hopeful picture than that delineated in the following passage it would be difficult to imagine:—

‘No equilibrium exists between the amount of labour seeking employment and the amount required under the present system of agriculture, nor between the limits of production and the earnings necessary to enable the labourer to live. Nor do we find any means of discovering this equilibrium so urgently needed. Where the soil is unkindly, arms and mouths immeasurably exceed the requirements of agriculture, and are altogether out of proportion to its produce. Where the land is fertile, or might be so, labour is not sufficiently remunerated; frequently, not sufficiently to allow the labourer to live. Labour is sought for, and paid with a certain amount of liberality, during a few days of summer. With the exception of those few days, employment is deemed almost an alms. Hence arises the infinitely hard lot of the day-labourer, who is almost necessarily led into improvidence, and for whom misery is a fate from which there is no possible escape. Some say that the evil depends on a mistaken system of agriculture. Others attribute it to deficiency of capital, to the absence of other industries subsidiary to agriculture, to the separation of class from class. And there is some amount of truth in each of these opinions. All these causes, and many others besides, are productive of extremely pernicious consequences. But the influence of each is complicated by the others, since no one of them acts separately. And from the contradictions of which we have evidence neither small nor doubtful, we are led to suspect that there are organic vices more profound than any which are *primâ facie* apparent.

‘That the division of property among numerous small owners is no efficacious remedy for the misery of the labouring classes, is attested

by the enormous number of peasant proprietors who are in extreme poverty. Their unenviable right as proprietors renders them responsible for the taxes, and they are frequently driven into exile by the sterility of the soil. Proprietors of the middle class, between the large and the small owners, who might be supposed to be vigilant in the management of their property but who unfortunately are not industrious, who are moderate in their requirements and averse to extremes, are practically liable to perpetual and irreparable financial disasters. The large proprietors, whether they be generous or grasping, greedy of gain or content with small returns, have not proved the means of comfort to the labouring population which it was hoped they might be. Sometimes extensive properties have the effect of diminishing malaria fevers (by drainage, &c.), but do nothing towards increasing the earnings of, or supplying increased labour to, the working class. For the most part, the effect of large properties is to place a greater distance between the proprietors and labourers than was the case formerly, and to give rise to rancorous feelings which in other times had no cause to exist. Rarely can it be said that a large proprietor makes large profits. Still more rarely is it the case that a labourer in his service earns sufficient to live.'

A deplorable picture indeed! And it shows, be it remembered, the condition of all the extensive provinces of the old Venetian territory, with the single exception of Verona. The reporter mentions several remedial measures which have been suggested, but shows the inefficiency or fallacy of them all. And then he makes a singular remark--it might rather, perhaps, be called a confession--which suggests, if not a remedy, at least a very potent cause for such widespread evils:—

'Improve your agriculture! is the cry of many, and this is easily said. But, *with the exception of here and there a well-intentioned individual more careful and more attentive than the generality*' (the italics are ours), 'who is there able to augment the net produce of his land by any plans of his own, or to obtain a moderately satisfactory return for the capital buried in the soil? I know that there exist, I myself am acquainted with, more than one well-to-do farmer, and here and there an *intelligent* proprietor of large estates, especially of rice grounds, who have no reason to repent of having sunk hundreds of thousands of francs in reclaiming land. Such men are true agricultural industrials, pursuing at once their own advantage and that of the labourer. But how many such are there? How many examples can be cited in the Venetian provinces?'

Now it must surely strike the reader that the words italicised above amount to an admission that the great majority of agriculturists throughout these provinces fail in the lamentable manner set forth, because they have not the qualities which in every business are necessary to success. All the farmers fail to do well, except those few who are 'intelligent' and more

‘ careful ’ and ‘ attentive ’ to their business than the generality. But will not this be the case always, and in every business? And saving that we Anglo-Saxons are wont to consider the unintelligent, the careless, and the inattentive as the exceptions instead of the rule, do we not see every day the same results amongst ourselves? The farmer who does not understand his business, or does not sedulously attend to it, sinks in the world, like similar persons in other walks of life. And it is very remarkable that Signor Morpurgo, while earnestly endeavouring to discover the causes of the general poverty and failure which he describes, should have penned the passage we have quoted, apparently without its having once crossed his mind that these causes might be sought in the fact that the intelligent and careful agriculturists (who succeed very well) are rare exceptions, few and far between.

In a subsequent chapter, on the changes in the condition and modes of life of the rural population during the last twenty or thirty years, Signor Morpurgo attributes a large portion of the discontent which he admits to be well-nigh universal to changes rather in the mental than the material condition of the peasantry.

‘ There is no corner of the Venetian provinces where it is not asserted that the rural population is no longer contented to live as it formerly lived. A close examination of this change shows that the new habits appear in the out-of-door life of the people, in that part of their life which is turned towards the outer world, rather than within the walls of their own dwellings or in the satisfaction of the first necessities of nature. Many peasants eat nothing but *polenta*, and, what is worse, *polenta* made of damaged corn, and dwell in habitations of the worst possible description, who nevertheless show a tendency to clothe themselves in better clothing. Here and there some old man who has not been persuaded to leave off wearing knee-breeches becomes a laughing-stock. The nuptial bed is no longer formed of planks and trestles, but has become a bedstead of walnut-wood, at the least. The deal box that contained all the belongings of the bride has turned into a polished press.’

But surely these last changes cannot be said to belong to out-of-door life rather than home life. And one would be inclined to say that the peasant who prefers to improve and embellish the home to which he brings his wife, rather than spend his money solely for the satisfaction of his appetite, had advanced a step, and not a small one, in civilisation.

The prætor of Tolmezzo writes : —

‘ The material advantages enjoyed by the labouring classes have been increased. But, on the other hand, the aspirations and desires of the

rural population have also greatly increased. Exigencies and desires which, a few years ago, were unknown in agricultural districts, now make themselves urgently felt, and create new needs to be satisfied. It is true that the Alpine populations of the regions furthest away from the great centres ordinarily preserve their ancient habits of sobriety and abnegation.'

This testimony to the superiority of the mountain populations over those of the plains recurs again and again with perfect unanimity. And it must be understood that it is always a moral, and not a material, superiority that is referred to. For according to constant testimony the mountaineers are poorer than the inhabitants of the plains. And the reporter is emphatic in asserting that no improvement in the condition of the rural populations is to be hoped for from the multiplication of small farms or peasant proprietors.

Here are a few of the replies elicited by enquiries into the present state of the rural labourers as compared with that of past years. 'Even in Alpine Ampezzo,' writes Signor Morpurgo, 'my informant speaks of the necessities which the people have created for themselves in respect of the *comforts of life.*' (Italics in original.) From Pordenone in the plain it is stated that 'the peasants, like all the other classes, aspire to a greater freedom of life and to increased comfort.' From Codroipo and from Latisana come complaints that 'the rural populations have greater needs than formerly, in consequence of desiring a degree of ease superior to their condition.' At Asolo in the province of Treviso, 'the peasants have a more intense desire to diminish their privations, not so much with regard to food as to clothing, and to indulgence in drinking and smoking.' From Biadene we have the remarkable statement that 'the peasantry' (meaning the farm labourers engaged by the year in contradistinction to labourers hired by the day) 'are not prone to waste their money in vices, especially not in drinking. But the men employed in the woods, and the day labourers, who have neither rooms to live in nor roof to sleep under, and who live like beasts, are very much addicted to excess and debauch. And fathers of families often leave those belonging to them without food and clothing, while they spend in liquor and gambling as much sometimes as five or ten francs.' Complaints of the great multiplication of drinking-shops, where the peasants not only spend money in drink, but play at cards, come from many districts. Such things were unheard of in times past.

It is remarkable that the reporter himself, and all his informants who have been led to touch the subject, speak of the

temporary migration of the rural population as an evil and a misfortune. But also emigration in the larger sense is assumed to be so clearly an evil that no word of enquiry on the subject is deemed necessary. And this, too, although it would seem that the Italian emigrant almost always leaves his home with the intention of returning to it. 'The distant hope,' writes the syndic of Oderzo, 'of eating a little meat, and drinking a little good wine with their daily meal, renders the peasant credulous of the promises of hired agents, and easily induces him to seek at a distance the comforts he cannot find at home.'

Signor Morpurgo remarks on the frequency of the testimonies to the fact that the complaints of the labouring population are often caused not by deficiency of necessities, but by an increased tendency to dissipation; and he says that such a tendency may well be excused by the excessive labour imposed on the peasants during a short period of the year, followed by what he calls 'the inhuman contradiction' of absolutely compulsory idleness during the remainder of their time. The evil effects, both moral and economical, of this alternation of excessive (though well paid) work with enforced idleness are again and again alluded to.

The *Procuratore Regio* at Bassano, the highest legal authority in the province, writes:—

'It is evident that the peasant is striving not only to liberate himself from the privations which he formerly endured with resignation, but to change his condition entirely. The emigration to America is prompted by the hope of quickly acquiring a fortune. And it is to be observed that it is not only the labourer, or even the farmer, who thus emigrates, but also the proprietor.' But the emigration to Germany and Austria has for its object merely the amelioration of the economical position of the emigrant for the time being.'

That is to say, it is only a temporary migration of a few months at a time.

The syndic of a commune in the province of Padua, where, as Signor Morpurgo testifies, the labourer is better off than elsewhere, complains that 'the labouring classes are desirous of appearing to belong to a higher class than their own; and many are restrained from indulging in expenses beyond their means, solely by the impossibility of obtaining credit.' From Cittadella comes the complaint that 'the peasants, like every other class, nowadays desire all manner of superfluities in clothing, in luxuries, such as coffee and tobacco, in leisure, and Sunday amusements.' In the hill country, as usual, things go on better. From the mountains to the north of

Verona it is reported that ‘the peasants are laborious, free from vice, and not more eager than in past times to escape from the privations incidental to their condition. Nor are they disposed to complain. But the reverse may be observed in the case of those who are idle. Such persons, who form the exception, are apt to envy the food and the luxuries of those in a superior position, and would fain pretend to stand on an equality with them.’

From Adria we hear that ‘a certain discontent formerly unknown, a mania for removing themselves from their own proper sphere, a comparative degree of luxury, have spread themselves among the rural population, and more especially among the women.’ At Crespino the peasants ‘feel their privations more acutely than formerly.’ From Lendinara we are told that ‘the peasants’ needs increase from demoralising contact with the workmen of the towns.’ This last complaint is frequent. It is constantly asserted that the morality and contentment of the rural populations are in proportion to their distance from any large centre. From one part of the province of Udine the reply to Signor Morpurgo’s question is as sad as laconic, ‘Our complaints are of poverty and hunger.’

It is not necessary to prolong this selection from the catalogue of lamentations collected from almost every commune in the Venetian provinces. We prefer to give some quotations from the reporter’s general summing up. He remarks that it is common to all men to be more or less discontented with their present condition, be it what it may. And on this subject he expends a great many wordy sentences, the gist of which we may give more briefly as follows: Although unlimited liberty of grumbling may lead to exaggeration, yet it is a comparatively safe outlet for discontent, and often prevents the danger of social collision. Still he considers it would be unwise to treat with easy-going indifference the loud and continually increasing lamentations from all the rural districts.

‘The difficulties,’ he writes, ‘in the condition of our labouring classes which have been recorded in the present report, are the causes of very sinister manifestations; and they are real, and growing in intensity. Wages disproportionate to the work performed, the high price of articles of primary necessity, onerous rents, want of work (not only at home, but in the districts to which emigration is directed), the persistence of bad seasons, diminution of gain from subsidiary industries, burdensome taxes—such are the complaints heard on all sides. Very frequently they are founded in truth. And they create real discontent, and in some places produce profound class divisions which are greatly to be regretted.’

No doubt the diapason of all but universal lamentation which pervades Signor Morpurgo's report is 'founded in truth.' The phrase, indeed, is hardly strong enough for the occasion. It cannot be doubted that his report bears abundant evidence to a most deplorable state of things in the wide and diversified district to which it applies. There are within those limits sterile and ungrateful mountain regions, but there are also some of the richest lands in Italy or in Europe; and if the lot of the tillers of these rich plains is compared with that of the mountaineers, the former appear to be, on the whole, in a more lamentable plight. It is important also to note that, although Signor Morpurgo's investigations were, according to the intention of Parliament, mainly directed to the condition of the labouring classes, yet it results from them unmistakeably that all classes connected with agriculture are alike in evil case. Landowners, farmers, labourers, and those whose position partakes of all those categories, are not sufferers of equal misery; but they are all, with few exceptions, in such an unprosperous state as to give them little possibility of aiding those worse off than themselves. It is true that here and there we meet with admissions indicating that incapacity, imprudence, ignorance, and idleness have a considerable share in producing the general misery. We also get occasional glimpses of more or less culpable maladministration on the part of local authorities, which must necessarily contribute to the same result. For example, Signor Morpurgo speaks of hungry and menacing crowds surrounding a *palazzo comunale* (town hall), recently constructed at considerable cost in a small commune of the province of Udine. Of course, by virtue of the *octroi* system, the famished crowds in question had been taxed to pay for the communal architectural magnificence. Such things very naturally result from entrusting a small body of men with the irresponsible expenditure of other men's money. The abuse is a very grievous one throughout the rural districts of the Peninsula. It is only one feature of a thoroughly vicious communal organisation, which is far too large a subject to be entered on here and now. It is one of the most fatal impediments in the path of Italy's social and economic progress; and it is to be hoped that the measure for its reform, promised by the present Prime Minister, may be sound and effective.

But when all is said, it is but too evident that the cry of poverty and distress which rises in one disheartening chorus from every class, and from every town, village, and hamlet, is the result, in the main, of *over-taxation*.

The principal cause of this over-taxation is to be found in

the necessity for supplying Italy's military requirements. A democratic journal published in Rome put, the other day, the following dilemma: What is the policy of building fortifications at enormous cost, when, in order to raise the money, you have to tax the people so enormously as to cause the physical degeneration of the race, and make it valueless for manning the fortresses when they are built? There is a good deal of exaggeration in such a suggestion, but that it is not wholly unreasonable will be admitted by those who may have read a paper treating of the *pellagra*, which appeared in these pages in January 1881. To enquire whether it be necessary, expedient, or wise, that Italy should maintain a military force at the cost of such a crushing taxation, would be to enter on a field altogether outside the scope of the present article. But this much may be asserted with accuracy: it is the national will of Italy that so it should be. No political party, from the Conservatives of the extreme Right to the Radicals of the extreme Left, is willing to hear of any diminution of the army.

It seems to be impossible to eradicate from the mind of Italians, even men of judgment and experience, the delusion that Italy is exposed to an armed attack from France, and has to defend herself against formidable enemies. We believe that opinion to be totally unfounded. The French have other matters to attend to, and they have nothing to gain by crossing the Alps. But the Italians appear to cherish their aversion to the French, to whom they owe their independence and emancipation from the yoke of Austria, and are content to ruin their population by immense armaments against an imaginary enemy. This state of things would seem to bring the country to a dead-lock, and to hopelessness of any issue short of absolute ruin, were it not for certain circumstances which must appear to Englishmen so extraordinary as to be scarcely credible.

The *imposta fondiaria*—the direct tax on real property, that is to say—forms the chief resource of the national revenue. Now this *imposta fondiaria* is levied according to a great number of different valuations made at different times, on different principles, and with different views. The kingdom of Italy has been welded out of seven different principalities, in each of which the *catasto* (government survey for purposes of taxation and other objects) was formed by widely differing methods. But this is not all. In every province of the kingdom districts may be found side by side, the official registered surveys of which result in wholly different estimates. These

diversities are so numerous, and arise from so complex a variety of causes, that it would need a volume of figures to state the facts, and another of antiquarian lore to explain their origin. The extent of the difference between the direct taxation levied on one part of the country, and that to which other parts are subjected, has been stated to be as nineteen to seventy-five! Startled by an assertion apparently so monstrous and incredible, we personally consulted the highest living authority on Italian statistics. The reply received was to the effect that the Piedmontese, Lombard, and Venetian provinces are taxed out of all proportion higher than the rest of Italy, especially higher than Sicily, the Neapolitan provinces, and Tuscany; and that while, in the North, the tax on real property for the most part reached seventy-five per cent. on the net value of the land, the inhabitants of Sicily, of the Neapolitan provinces, and of Tuscany, pay scarcely nineteen. Were we wrong in saying that to an Englishman it must seem well-nigh incredible that such a state of things should have been tolerated in a constitutional country for over twenty years?

It has not been tolerated without grievous and unceasing complaints. The *perequazione della fondiaria*—the equalisation of the tax on property—is a standing demand which makes itself heard in every successive parliament. More than one ministry has promised to take the matter in hand. The present ministry is believed to be seriously occupied with it. But the hopes of the unhappy proprietors and still more unhappy peasants of the oppressed provinces do not run very high. The merely technical difficulties in the way of a new assessment of the entire country are very great; but these are very far from being the most serious which have to be fought with. The members of the Chamber of Deputies who are returned by the districts most lightly taxed are more numerous than those elected by the inhabitants of the highly taxed provinces. The injustice is so monstrous that it might be supposed no man could be found with front sufficiently brazen to insist on its perpetuation. Unhappily the reverse is the case. And we fear it is certain that but few members representing electoral colleges in the lightly taxed regions would retain their seats after having voted for the *perequazione della fondiaria*. An amusing sample of the temper and intellectual calibre of some of these gentlemen has recently been afforded during some preliminary discussions provoked by the promise of a ministerial bill on the subject. They have generously allowed that some relief ought to be given to the severely

taxed provinces, but not at the cost of their own provinces. 'Remit the taxation of the North by all means,' say they; 'but do not dream of increasing ours.' In short, the opposition to any really effectual measure on the subject will be so violent and persistent as to render it doubtful whether any such can be passed.

The technical difficulties which stand in the way of the formation of a new general *catasto* have been adverted to. And it is undeniable that they are very great—chiefly after all, however, resolving themselves into a question of expense. But when once this difficulty shall have been grappled with, a periodical revision of the *catasto*, such as is the case in India, and as is absolutely indispensable for the just assessment of a land tax, where this forms an important part of the revenue of the country, would present no difficulty.

It can hardly be expected that these unhappy Venetian provinces will continue indefinitely to pay an amount of taxation nearly fourfold that which is paid by others of their fellow-subjects. Nor can the economist believe that it will long be possible for them to pay it, however much they may wish to do so. The excess of taxation is crushing the life out of the country. And in face of the tremendous fact of such taxation, all Signor Morpurgo's careful examination of the causes which contribute to produce the general pauperisation and the chorus of lamentations recorded by him, is little better than supererogatory. The hardy mountaineers are abandoning their bits of property, and seeking to better their position by emigration, in increasing numbers. The less sturdy and still more miserable lowlanders are swelling from year to year the portentous list of the *pellagrosi*.

Despite all this, Italy, as a whole, is yearly becoming richer, though not so rapidly as she ought to do. But armies cannot continue to be maintained by a tax of seventy-five per cent. levied from the land on which Signor Morpurgo's miserable clients starve; and the noisy Radical patriots of the lightly taxed South will do well to persuade themselves of that fact.

ART. IV.—*Histoire du droit et des institutions politiques, civiles et judiciaires de l'Angleterre, comparés au droit et aux institutions de la France depuis leur origine jusqu'à nos jours.* Par ERNEST GLASSON. Vols. 1-5. Paris: 1882, 1883.

THE title-page which we have here transcribed sets forth a programme of almost unlimited extent. Every branch of our legal history, constitutional, civil, and criminal, from the earliest glimmer of tradition down to the latest Act of Parliament, is included in its compendious terms; and its generality is still further enlarged by a promised comparison of English and French institutions. A work of this comprehensive character has long been a desideratum. Admirable treatises have been produced, dealing with various subdivisions of the subject, some being confined to particular epochs, others to special branches; but until M. Glasson published the work whose title we have placed at the head of this article, no author had in recent times ventured to combine all the historical aspects of English law, and attack the subject in its formidable integrity.

Whatever knowledge of the past the professional lawyer has leisure to acquire, is derived from the pages of Blackstone or Reeves, but both these authors wrote in the last century, when many subjects of historical interest, which have since been elucidated by critical research, remained in a condition of hopeless obscurity. Blackstone, moreover, unrivalled master of contemporary law, was, as an historian, superficial and inaccurate; while Reeves left his work incomplete, and expressed his learning in a style of almost prohibitive dulness. Modern versions of the 'Commentaries' fail to supply the deficiencies of these standard works. They, for the most part, accept the original text with unquestioning faith, and alter it only so far as may be necessary to bring it into conformity with subsequent legislation.

There being thus no adequate or complete history of English law written in the English language, it is not a little remarkable that a foreigner should attempt to occupy the vacant field. We gladly welcome such an undertaking, and bear testimony to the industry and erudition displayed by M. Glasson in the preparation of his important work. By his comparative study of English and French institutions, he introduces us to a subject of enquiry which has not received in this country as much attention as it deserves; and he greatly

increases the utility of his book as a work of reference by prefixing an exhaustive bibliography to each of the eight parts into which it is divided. We cannot, however, accept it as an entirely satisfactory history of English law. Its arrangement, as we shall presently show, is defective; and as the work is professedly written for the purpose of comparing English with French institutions, the space assigned to the several branches of our complicated system is determined rather by their international relations than by their intrinsic importance. The circumstances under which the book was composed sufficiently account for this disproportion. The French Institute proposed as the subject of the first Odilon Barrot competition a comparison of the English and French systems of jurisprudence, from the thirteenth century to the present time, with special reference to the improvements which might be adopted in France as the result of such comparison. In answer to this invitation M. Glasson sent in a memoir which was justly described by M. Giraud,* in his Report, as ‘a work of colossal proportions, the fruit of long and patient researches, which will take its place among the most esteemed productions that have been crowned by the Institute.’ The history which M. Glasson now gives to the world is the prize essay thus commended by the highest literary authority in France.

It has been already stated that M. Glasson's arrangement of his work is defective. We must now proceed to justify that criticism, by showing that he ignores the true historical method. The rough plan of the work is of this description. The entire past is parcelled out into eight somewhat arbitrary divisions, for each of which the author furnishes an elaborate dissertation upon the then existing laws and customs, following as closely as possible the same routine in each part of his work. ‘The King,’ ‘Parliament,’ ‘Property,’ &c., reappear as the titles of separate essays in each period, unconnected with each other, or with the essays on the same subjects in the other volumes of the series. Beyond this rude division into periods of a century or two, the chronological arrangement is, in general, no further followed, and the phrase of constant recurrence, ‘in the epoch at which we have arrived,’ might in many instances be advantageously replaced by a closer approximation to dates. This method of successive essays loses sight of the distinctive feature of history, which is the sequence of events knit together by the relations of cause and effect, and M. Glasson's

* Rapport sur le concours relatif au Prix Odilon Barrot : Académie des Sciences morales et politiques, tome xvi. p. 414.

work is, on this account, a chronicle rather than a history; a chronicle, too, in which the unit of time is inconveniently large. We cannot, indeed, demand in a history of law the same rigid adherence to chronological order as in a history of events; and it is not always possible to track the footsteps of custom, or to describe in words the gradual social changes which culminate in a prohibitive or regulating statute; but, after making allowance for these difficulties, we expect a nearer approach to orderly narrative than is furnished by these volumes.

M. Glasson's treatment of his subject is open to unfavourable criticism in another particular. The necessity of regarding English laws and institutions from a French point of view has led him to dwell at disproportionate length on those parts of our system which admit of comparison with the jurisprudence of France. The history of landed property is unduly abridged, that of procedure and judicial organisation unnecessarily expanded. He sees, moreover, the entire subject in inverted perspective; modern history being 'foreshortened in the tract 'of time' to the mental vision of an author who takes up his station at the Norman Conquest.

We have freely criticised the arrangement of M. Glasson's work, but his shortcomings in this respect find their best apology in the inherent difficulty of combining and carrying on simultaneously the histories of many subjects which have little connexion one with the other. Writers, even on particular branches of legal history, have found it impossible to maintain a continuous narrative, its current inevitably dividing, with the increasing complexity of the modern system, into a delta of diverging streams. In a work, therefore, so comprehensive as M. Glasson's, it would be vain to expect that unity of treatment which cannot be sustained within comparatively restricted limits. The history of criminal law and that of real property have no more relation to each other than the histories of Persia and Peru; and we must remember that it is not two, but a multitude of separate subjects, whose progress, like that of an unruly flock, has to be shepherded by the legal historian. We shall endeavour, in the following pages, with the assistance of M. Glasson's valuable text, to indicate the principal sources from which our modern English law has been derived; and, in doing so, we shall dwell rather on those social changes which contained in themselves the seeds of subsequent legislation, than upon the actual laws from time to time appearing on the Statute-book. In this brief and necessarily imperfect outline we can trace only the great landmarks of the

past. We must leave it to our readers to fill in such details as will enable them to grasp the fundamental truth, that law is the result of slow but persistent causes which from age to age have shaped it in conformity with the varying social conditions of the people.

In the history of English law there are two events which stand out before all others on account of the important consequences which flowed naturally from them. These are the occupation of the country by the Saxons in the fifth and sixth centuries, and the conquest by the Normans in the eleventh. The English race was founded by the one and modified by the other. In both instances the new-comers brought with them a great part of their laws and institutions; but, while the effete Celtic population faded away without producing any perceptible effect on their pagan conquerors, the Saxon and the Norman blended after a time into a single people, whose laws, like their language and their blood, were compounded of elements derived from the two races.

Our ancient lawyers insisted, according to Blackstone, with 'abundance of warmth,' that the common law of England was derived in unbroken succession from the customs of the primitive Britons. This view of its origin has, however, been long since abandoned. It is scarcely less ridiculous to attribute to the ancient Britons the formation of our unwritten law, than it would be to seek among the Cherokees for the principles of the American constitution. Not within the precincts of this island, but in the forests of the Elbe, do we now trace the first germs of what is called our Common Law. From the same locality proceeded the barbarian hordes which overflowed the northern parts of France, and this community of Germanic origin enables us to study the modifications introduced by different circumstances in the laws and customs of the same people. The comparison of corresponding institutions is not only possible, but extremely useful; for it becomes, in the absence of perfect knowledge, a valuable source of suggestion and information. The two systems often supplement each other, what is obscure in the one being frequently elucidated by the ampler records of the second system. The influences, however, to which the continental Germans were subjected were, as M. Glasson points out in the following passage, very different from those experienced by the Anglo-Saxons in their isolated home:—

'At the very outset of our comparative study of the institutions of our country and those of England, we are confronted by a difference which we can never lose sight of, even after this lapse of time. The

barbarians who invade Gaul have the same manners, the same customs, the same laws, the same organisation, as those of England; but these institutions, laws, and manners, are immediately subjected to the powerful influence of Roman civilisation. In their forests beyond the Rhine the Franks had formed true democratic republics. Royalty was a gift of fortune; the tribe chose its magistrates; the nation voted upon all important questions of interest to the State. In Gaul we are witnesses of a very different spectacle. Monarchy is framed upon the Roman model. It becomes inviolable and transmissible, like a patrimony, instead of remaining elective. The king it is who governs, assisted by favourites gathered together at his court.' (Vol. i. p. 75.)

It was the circumscribing ocean that saved *our* monarchy from being also framed upon the Roman model, and enabled our Saxon forefathers to establish democratic institutions, whose influence, despite the persistent attacks of three dynasties, is happily felt at the present day. The sovereign power of the State resided not in the king but in the Witenagemot, whose powers and constitution are involved in the utmost obscurity,* but in which all historians recognise the germ of the future English Parliament.

From the reign of Ethelbert, King of Kent (A.D. 600), we possess various collections of laws for the separate kingdoms into which the country was then divided. These laws are chiefly concerned with the amendment or enforcement of the unwritten customs, with the innovations rendered necessary by the conversion of the people to Christianity, and with the assessment in money of various forms of personal injury. Crime was not then regarded as an outrage on society, but conferred on the victim, or, in case of his murder, on his family, a right to compensation from the criminal. The general character of this legislation M. Glasson thus sums up:—

'Rules relating to procedure, to contracts, to the organisation of the family, seldom appear, and are almost always incomplete, whereas details as to the rights of the Church and clergy are furnished in abundance. Very often these laws merely lay down for the judges general rules of conduct, leaving to their consciences the decision of other matters according to equity and tradition.' (Vol. i. p. 24.)

After the several kingdoms of the Heptarchy were united under one sovereign, it became a matter of the first importance that their conflicting laws should be reduced to conformity.

* Mr. Freeman considers that the Witenagemot comprised all the free men of the nation; Canon Stubbs that only certain dignitaries were present; while M. Glasson adopts the *via media*, and expresses the opinion that there were councils of both kinds. (Tome i. p. 44.)

This task was accomplished by the king who, alone among our English sovereigns, has been styled the Great; a title worthily earned, as much by the consecration of all his life's energy to the service of his country, as by the success of his arms and the brilliancy of his talents. Splendid as the achievements of Alfred undoubtedly were, still more has been attributed to him than he actually performed. His name became a focus of mythical legend, and whenever the origin of a custom was obscure, its authorship was invariably ascribed to him. Hume, whose errors Blackstone on all occasions faithfully reproduces, credits him with the division of the kingdom into hundreds and tithings, the establishment of the principle of collective responsibility, and the invention of Trial by Jury; but the germs of these institutions existed long before the reign of Alfred, and their final forms were not attained until long after his death.*

When stripped of all exaggeration, King Alfred's part in the formation of his country as a working machine is still considerable. M. Glasson thus summarises the work which he performed:—

‘He strengthened the existing system under which the country was divided into hundreds and tithings by uniting with it the principle of collective responsibility. Ashamed of the ignorance of his subjects, he obtained the services of learned men and founded numerous schools; he displayed extraordinary severity towards judges who betrayed their trust. This prince was a man of letters in comparison with his fellow-countrymen; he knew the learned languages and the greater number of the books of antiquity; in his youth he had traversed the southern countries of Europe; moreover, his legislative work is the most remarkable of the time. Ancient historians call Alfred the Great *legum Anglicanarum conditor*, as they confer upon Edward the Confessor the name of *restitutor*. Alfred set himself to give unity to legislation by fusing the laws of Ethelbert, of Ine, and of Offa into a single code.’ (Vol. i. p. 28.)

The next important accession which the laws of England received was due to the invasion of the Danes; but the changes produced under their rule have been much exaggerated. The Saxons and the Danes belonged to the same family of nations, came from the same locality, and lived under the same social and political organisation. Their conquest of the country, therefore, resembled rather a forcible change of dynasty than the overthrow of a nation. ‘The good laws of Edward the Confessor,’ for which the people vainly

* Freeman's ‘Norman Conquest,’ vol. i. p. 53.

clamoured long after the Norman Conquest, are no longer extant; but we may conjecture that they were chiefly occupied with the task of restoring the state of things which prevailed before the coming of the Danes.

From what has been said it will be apparent how meagre were the written laws in Anglo-Saxon times, and how much of the life of the people was governed by unwritten or customary law. This is the reason why it is so difficult to ascertain with precision the forms of land-tenure, the rights of succession, the procedure of the courts, and many other details of everyday life in that remote period. Few questions, for example, have been more discussed, and few have remained more obscure, than the origin of Trial by Jury. This 'bulwark of English liberty' is certainly not to be found in its modern form among the Anglo-Saxons; but it is generally conceded that from their procedure, by a gradual process of development, this institution has been derived. M. Glasson, in the following passage, gives expression to the views which at the present day meet with most general acceptance:--

'In point of fact the jury was evolved gradually. This institution did not appear suddenly at any particular epoch. In embryo among the Anglo-Saxons, it developed insensibly, became by degrees subject to fixed rules, and ended by assuming a permanent form. In England the jury was at first regarded as an element of proof, and English jurists, even at the present day, feel the influence of this origin. They speak of the jury in connexion with evidence, while French lawyers consider the jury rather as one of the elements in certain jurisdictions. In ancient English law, and even among the Saxons, the procedure by jury is only a manner of proof which the parties may require, or the judges may officially order in certain cases. During the Anglo-Saxon epoch the most important acts of civil life were performed in the presence of witnesses, and in all cases those which had not been so performed were none the less known by the neighbours. Thus, in case of dispute it was quite natural to call these neighbours who had personal knowledge of the affair, in order to elicit information from them. At a later period, the publicity attaching to acts of civil life having partly disappeared, and the administrative system of the tithing, which no longer included all the inhabitants, being relaxed under the influence of feudalism, it became impossible to call neighbours having a personal acquaintance with the facts. It was necessary to rest satisfied with respectable and competent persons. But then by force of circumstances the functions of these persons were altered: they were no longer asked what they knew of the affair, but merely what their opinion was.' (Vol. i. pp. 263-4.)

In some such manner as this, the witnesses of former times became modern jurymen; no longer deciding from their own

knowledge, but receiving and weighing the evidence of others, and embodying their conclusion in the form of a verdict.

Although the civil and political aspects of Anglo-Saxon life are but imperfectly known to us, we possess abundant details as to the procedure in criminal cases. The ordeal, first mentioned in the reign of Ine and formally abolished only in that of Henry III., assumed several forms; but they all rested on the superstitious belief that Providence would interpose to declare the guilt or innocence of the accused. Not very consistently, however, with this belief, or pretended belief, the test operation was made the subject of the most scrupulous mundane definition. The exact weight of the hot iron, the degree of heat to which it was raised, the distance to which it was carried, the time during which the burned hand was sealed up, were all specified as carefully as if the Divine power might be easily overstrained. The various forms of ordeal are too well known to require description here, but we may mention that in most cases the accused had the privilege of substituting for this extremely obnoxious mode of trial that by compurgators or co-jurors, in which an acquittal was secured by the oaths of substantial friends. It was only the slave and the perjurer against whom this easy door was closed. The latter, indeed, might still clear himself by triple purgation, or three times the number of oaths required under the same circumstances by an immaculate character; but the miserable slave, unless manumitted by his lord, had to undergo the ordeal by cold water, in which his innocence was attested by his sinking to the bottom, his guilt by his rising to the surface; so that he had nothing to look forward to but the miserable alternative of being drowned or hanged.

We cannot leave this period without referring to the Anglo-Saxon code of punishments. Originally designed to wean the people from the animal law of vengeance, pecuniary compensation became the recognised punishment of crime. The *Wer-geld*, or compensation for murder, was nicely graduated according to the social status of the victim; and it became a convenient standard for the measurement both of his wrongs and his dignity. Every physical injury was estimated in money, and the price to be paid to the sufferer varied not only with his *Wer-geld*, but with the extent and position of the wound. The following extract from M. Glasson's pages will convey some idea of the estimated importance of the various organs:—

‘Twelve shillings is to be paid for cutting off an ear, six for simply slitting it. Gouging out an eye is estimated at fifty shillings. Every

wound of an inch in length costs one shilling; unless it be on the face, when it is set down at two. The price of the wound depends on the inconvenience caused, especially in battle, more than on the deformity occasioned thereby: thus, slicing off the nose is cheaper than the amputation of the thumb, and cutting off the ear is a much more serious affair than slitting the upper lip.' (Vol. i. p. 309.)

When the *Wer-geld* was not duly paid, the right of private vengeance revived; and so logically was the principle carried out, that when the parties were of unequal value a sufficient number of the murderer's family might be slain to redress the balance of blood-money. The tendency to take the law into their own hands is strong in rude peoples, and all that religion and civil government by their united efforts were at first able to effect was to place limits on the wild justice of revenge. For this purpose was established the celebrated Truce of God, lasting from Wednesday evening in each week until the following Monday morning; and also the right of asylum in churches and other privileged places. By a law of Alfred's, a definite meaning is given to the expression 'An English-man's house is his castle;' for it ordained that no freeman could be slain within his house. All that the avengers were entitled to do was to besiege him in that place of refuge until he surrendered to justice, or his friends had given security for his due appearance.

M. Glasson comprises in his second volume the period from the Norman Conquest to the accession of John. This epoch of convulsion and rapid development is of paramount interest in the history of our institutions; which have since received no propulsion or disturbance from external forces, but have slowly, and for the most part quietly, changed themselves to suit the altered circumstances of successive generations. When the tumult of the invasion had subsided, which was only after the men of Senlac had disappeared, the long results of that battle began to forge themselves into definite shapes. The twelfth century was mainly occupied with this task. M. Glasson does not traverse step by step this long avenue to Magna Carta, nor does he trace the gradual fusion of the two races, or the bitter conflict between Church and State; but he supplies us instead with a series of essays upon various questions of legal and constitutional interest. Norman feudalism in its all-pervading influence is presented to the reader; who is thus enabled to realise, by comparison with the corresponding essays of the first volume, how complete was the change produced since the days of Anglo-Saxon rule in every department of

law. It must not, however, be supposed that any legislative revolution was effected by the Conqueror, or that any sudden and general change was introduced in the established institutions of the country. William, on the contrary, at all events in the early part of his reign, intended to maintain English laws for the government of his English subjects. It is related that he even endeavoured to learn their language, but failed on account of his advanced years. But the force of events was too strong for him to control. The invasion was carried out on so grand a scale that the whole structure of society was changed, and from its altered circumstances new institutions were gradually and inevitably developed.

The effect produced by the Norman Conquest upon the English nation is thus described by Mr. Freeman, who adopts on this subject a theory intermediate between those of M. Thierry and Sir F. Palgrave:—

‘The Norman Conquest, instead of wiping out the race, the laws, or the language which existed before it, did but communicate to us a certain foreign infusion in all three branches, which was speedily absorbed and assimilated into the pre-existing mass.’ *

And the same idea is more fully expressed in the following passage:—

‘What the constitution was under Ædgar, that it remained under William. This assertion must be taken with all the practical drawbacks which are involved in the forcible transfer of the crown to a foreign dynasty, and in the division of the greater part of the lands of the kingdom among the followers of the foreign king. But the constitution remained the same; the laws, with a few changes in detail, remained the same; the language of public documents remained the same. The powers which were vested in King William and his Witan remained constitutionally the same as those which had been vested in King Ædgar and his Witan a hundred years before. The change in the social condition of the country, the change in the spirit of the national and local administration, the change in the relation of the kingdom to foreign lands were changes as great as words can express.’ †

The last sentence explains the paradox that the laws were unaltered, yet that in a few decades the entire system was found to be ordered on the Norman model. ‘The change in the social condition of the country was as great as words can express.’ It is scarcely probable that such a change should

* Freeman's ‘History of the Norman Conquest,’ Preface, p. viii.

† Ibid. vol. i. p. 72.

be unaccompanied by swift and radical changes in the laws themselves, and in their administration; and if we consider what this 'social change' really amounted to, we shall more readily appreciate the vast results which were potentially contained in the first catastrophe.

The Norman Conquest was no mere transfer of legal power from one sovereign to another, as the consequence of successful warfare; the entire fabric of the State was rudely shaken, and groaned under the tyrannies of a military aristocracy. Englishmen were suddenly excluded from civil power; the bishops were hunted from their sees, and the abbots from their convents; and the great body of landowners were supplanted by rapacious and insolent foreigners. The crown, the legislature, the administration of justice, the church, and the land fell into the hands of the Normans, who made use of their powers for the oppression of their degraded predecessors. The confiscations were carried out on so vast a scale that William was enabled out of the forfeited property of the Church to create 28,015 knights' fees. To one favoured follower, Robert Earl of Moreton, were allotted 248 manors in Cornwall, 54 in Sussex, 196 in Yorkshire, 99 in Northampton, and smaller numbers in other counties. The 60,000 knights, adventurers, and men-at-arms who accompanied the Conqueror had to be accommodated with similar, though less extensive, grants; and, before the tell-tale record, Domesday Book, was compiled (A.D. 1086), the confiscation of the entire area of the country had been almost completed. Remembering that commerce was in those days non-existent, that the countless forms of modern industry had not yet been discovered, and that to land alone men looked for subsistence, we may realise the wholesale character of the social revolution effected by the Norman Conquest. The population of England at this period has been variously estimated; but two millions of free inhabitants, or less than one-tenth of its present population, may be accepted as a superior limit of its possible numbers. The sudden incursion, therefore, of 60,000 adult males, constantly recruited moreover by new-comers from Normandy, must have caused a disturbance of social equilibrium, even if it had not been accompanied by the terrors of war and the cruelties of confiscation. The new occupiers, too, entered into possession of their demesnes to administer them not upon Saxon principles of law, but in accordance with the lessons of feudalism which they had already learned in the country of their origin. This violent and complete alteration of land tenure was in itself sufficient to account for a great part of

the changes gradually introduced in other departments of law ; but its influence was strengthened by the difference of language, and the mutual hatred of the two races. William's conciliatory policy disappeared on the first show of resistance to his authority ; and confiscations were followed by hopeless and ill-organised insurrections, which led in their turn to fresh confiscations. He introduced the savage code of Norman punishments, substituting in all cases mutilation for death, that the maimed body might remain a living witness of the flagitiousness of the crime. The forest laws also served as a continual reminder of the bitterness of subjugation. These laws were enforced by sanctions so terrible that the Saxon chronicler bitterly exclaims that William loved the great game as if he had been their father. The two peoples for a generation or more occupied the country without intermingling, resembling rather armies in hostile camps than subjects of the same king. The English had been stripped of their worldly possessions, and were little better than outlaws in their own land. They were not slow, when opportunity offered, to wreak vengeance upon stragglers from the Norman host. To protect his Frenchmen from such crimes of violence, William, imitating a similar law of Canute's, ordained that whenever a Norman was slain, if the criminal were not discovered, the hundred should be fined for the murder. The fact of nationality, however, being in many cases difficult of proof, a presumption was established that every person found dead was of foreign birth, unless it was proved by affirmative evidence that he was an Englishman. This led to the celebrated 'Presentment of Englishry,' an enquiry which was held in every case of death under suspicious circumstances, until it was finally abolished by statute in the reign of Edward III., when the complete fusion of the two races rendered its continuance unnecessary.

From the introduction of the feudal system there followed immediately two results of the utmost importance in the law of property : one, the abolition of the testamentary power over land, which was not regained until the reign of Henry VIII. ; the other, the substitution of primogeniture for the principle of equal division which regulated succession in the Saxon times. The descent of lands to the eldest son to the exclusion of his brothers was at first confined to tenure in chivalry ; but in the reign of Henry III. it was also adopted in the case of socage lands ; and the 'heir-at-law' has ever since maintained his position of supremacy.

In the administration of justice changes of some import-

ance were introduced by the Conqueror. Thus, adopting M. Glasson's summary :—

‘There was an English exchequer, as there had been an exchequer of Normandy. A circumstance of greater importance was the separation of the spiritual and temporal courts. The judicial combat was introduced for the Normans, but it was very soon accepted freely by the Saxons, and became a common institution. Judicial documents were drawn up in French, and this language came into general use in the administration of justice. The conquerors set themselves to render their own tongue predominant. The French language everywhere prevailed, and the Saxon sank to the condition of a vulgar and despised idiom.’ (Vol. ii. p. 16.)

One of the most characteristic usages of the feudal system is that referred to in the passage which has just been quoted as the ‘judicial combat.’ This arbitrament of force was admitted in three cases only : (1) Disputes in the court of chivalry, a dramatic example of which is furnished by the first act of Shakespeare's *Richard II.* (2) Appeals of felony. And (3) The solemn decision of the most important, from a feudal point of view, of all civil actions, namely, the final determination of the title to land. In the civil action the parties were represented by champions for the curious reason that if either plaintiff or defendant had been killed in the battle, the action would have abated, and no judgment could have been entered for the victorious party. The manner in which the combat was conducted is narrated by Blackstone with his usual quaint felicity. After describing the preliminary proceedings in the action he continues :—

‘A piece of ground is then in due time set out, of sixty feet square, enclosed with lists, and on one side a court erected for the judges of the Court of Common Pleas, who attend there in their scarlet robes; and also a bar is prepared for the learned serjeants-at-law. When the court sits, which ought to be by sunrising, proclamation is made for the parties and their champions, who are introduced by two knights, and are dressed in a coat of armour, with red sandals, barelegged from the knee downwards, bareheaded, and with bare arms to the elbows. The weapons allowed them are only batons, or staves of an ell long, and a four-cornered leather target; so that death very seldom ensued this civil combat. In the court military, indeed, they fought with sword and lance, according to Spelman and Rushworth; as likewise in France only villeins fought with the buckler and baton—gentlemen armed at all points.’ *

After each of the champions had taken an oath against sorcery and enchantment, the battle began, and lasted, unless one of

* Blackstone's ‘Commentaries,’ vol. iii. p. 339.

the combatants was killed, or pronounced 'the horrible word' *Craven*, until the stars appeared in the evening. Judgment in general followed victory, but if the champion of the defendant maintained the combat throughout the day the action was decided in his favour. In the reign of Henry II. an effort was made to supersede this brutal encounter by the establishment of the *grand assize*, but it continued to be occasionally practised until the seventeenth century.*

So profoundly did the feudal system affect every department of the State, every relation of life, and every incident of property, that we may almost ignore every other change, and regard the Conquest as summed up in the one great fact—the introduction of Norman feudalism. The Anglo-Saxons would probably, like the other Germanic tribes, by their own unaided efforts, have eventually developed a more or less complete feudal system. They had even taken some steps in this direction when their tardy progress was suddenly arrested by the coming of the Normans. Saxon land, for example, was subject to something resembling a feudal burden in what was called the *trinoda necessitas*, or military service and repair of castles and bridges; and the practice of 'commendation' constituting a personal relationship of dependence on the one side, and protection on the other, differed only from the feudal compact of lord and vassal in one particular, that it was not necessarily connected with the occupancy of land. But the characteristic incidents of feuds as we know them later on, as well as the crushing burdens of feudal tenure, are all wanting. The power of alienation was relatively unrestricted, and the duty of military service was a personal obligation rather than a territorial charge. We may assume that the germs of feudalism already existed among the Saxons, that the nation was partially prepared for its reception, but in all its practical bearings upon the lives of men the feudal system was essentially of Norman origin.

This tremendous innovation was not the result of any formal

* The last battle waged in the Court of Common Pleas was held in Tothill Fields, Westminster, A.D. 1571; but it appears from Sir James Dyer's 'Reports,' p. 301, he himself having been one of the judges present, that the demandant made default, and that no actual combat took place. There was a trial by battle in the Court of Chivalry in 1631, and in the County Palatine of Durham in 1638. An attempt having been made early in the present century to revive this obsolete practice in an appeal of murder (see *Ashford v. Thornton*, 1 Barn. & Ald. p. 405), trial by battle, both in civil and criminal matters, was formally abolished by the Statute 59 Geo. III. c. 46 (A.D. 1819).

act of the legislature, nor can it be ascribed to the will of the Conqueror as a scheme of deliberate organisation. It was rather the consequence of the confiscation and subsequent grant of a great part of the soil of England to Norman knights. These new owners would naturally hold their lands or sublet them to others, upon the terms with which they were already familiar in their own country; and thus, whether in each grant conditions of feudal tenure were expressly mentioned or not, almost the entire area of England came to be subject to the Norman customs. This fiction of feudal tenure, as M. Glasson points out,* rapidly extended to the properties which at first remained alodial. The current of feudalism overwhelmed everything, and while there was a constant tendency towards conversion of alodial into feudal land, there was no possibility of return to the condition of absolute proprietorship. M. Glasson thus explains this process of conversion:—

‘These free lands were rapidly absorbed in the feudal system. Two causes have chiefly contributed to their extinction: the precarious position of alodial proprietors and the influence of the Norman lawyers. As a result of the civil wars the alodial proprietors found themselves at the mercy of the strongest; and, in order to escape from violence and aggression, they consented to change their free properties into fiefs under the protection of the king or of a lord. On the other hand, the Norman jurists early laid down the principle that all land is held of the king in fee.’ (Vol. ii. p. 171.)

Tenure is, even at the present day, the fundamental conception of English land law. No subject is the owner of land. He holds it as tenant of somebody, and in the last resort of the Crown. The idea of absolute ownership has to be entirely eradicated before we advance a single step in the study of real property law. This fiction of the legal mind has, indeed, now no practical consequences except in the case of escheat; but in the reign of the Conqueror and long afterwards it was very different, for the incidents of tenure were then of the most onerous character. The revenue of the king, the defence of the realm, the income of the individual, and all the relations of private life are so intimately bound up with this system of feudal imposts, that we must now briefly refer to their more important features.

Four types of land tenure present themselves at this period, knights' service, free socage, frankalmoign and villenage. The first of these was the most important and honourable, but the second has outlasted all the rest and is the prevailing tenure of

* Tom. ii. p. 142.

modern times. Frankalmoign, or tenure in free alms, was that by which the church held its lands; and no earthly service was incident to this tenure, the orisons, prayers, masses, and other divine services, as Littleton says, 'being better for the lords ' than any doing of fealty.' *

When land was held in villenage, the services were such as a free man would disdain to perform, and the possession scarcely amounted to property; for the villein was a serf whose condition closely resembled personal servitude, and his tenure, until it grew into the modern copyhold, was only a right of occupancy at the will of his lord.

Knights' service was the characteristic tenure of the age of chivalry. Homage, fealty, and personal service in the field for a term not exceeding forty days in each year (in the reign of Henry II. commuted for a money payment called *escuage*), were essential to this mode of holding land. The stipulated services consisted sometimes in furnishing a certain number of men-at-arms, sometimes in the personal attendance of the vassal on his lord. When Edward I. ordered the Earls of Hereford and Norfolk to go over with his army into Guienne, they replied that the tenure of their lands did not oblige them to do so, unless His Majesty went in person. The King insisted; and, with a vehement oath, said to Hereford, 'Sir Earl, you shall ' either go or hang.' To this the Earl with equal vehemence replied, 'Sir King, I will neither go nor hang.' So well established were the rights of the nobles, that the imperious Edward did not venture to press the point further.†

The subject which created the most lively conflict between the lords and their tenants was the feudal service of 'aids.' These were payments made to the lord on occasions of exceptional pressure on his finances.

'Aids,' says M. Glasson, 'were at first legally due only in three cases: the ransom of the lord, the assumption of arms by his eldest son, and the marriage of his eldest daughter. But feudal tyranny rapidly increased the number of these occasions. Lords imposed aids for the payment of the whole or part of their debts; they exacted them when they inherited the suzerain rights of the fief; and some compelled their vassals to contribute towards their own aids.' (Vol. ii. p. 192.)

There was in the time of Glanville no precise rule for ascertaining the amount which should be paid on each occasion; and the king and other feudal lords availed themselves of this uncertainty to change what was originally a 'benevolence'

* Littleton, § 135.

† Gilbert 'On Tenures,' Introduction by Watkins, p. xv.

into an arbitrary and oppressive tax. Thus while Henry I., on the marriage of his daughter, demanded only three shillings for each hide of land, Henry III. exacted two marks to furnish a dowry for his sister. In the Great Charter of John we find a provision that the king should not impose new aids without the consent of Parliament, which furnishes the first instance of the control of taxation by that body.

Another source of revenue to the lord was the Relief, which was a sum of money paid by the heir when he did homage on the death of his ancestor. No hereditary right of succession was at first recognised by the lord, the acceptance of the heir as tenant being regarded as an act of grace. This voluntary renewal of the feudal compact furnished a favourable opportunity for fresh exaction, which after a time assumed the character of a legal demand, although the heir no longer succeeded by courtesy but by an established right. After the military services had been commuted into *escuage*, the relief was generally fixed at one-fourth of this sum. The services in respect of a single knight's fee were estimated at the annual value of 20*l.*, and of a barony or earldom at 400*l.* The reliefs payable in these cases were therefore 5*l.* and 100*l.* respectively.

The most oppressive of all the feudal incidents were wardship and marriage. If the heir was an infant when he succeeded to the tenancy, the stipulated services could not be rendered to the lord, who recouped himself for their loss by seizing the profits of the fief. He was also, by virtue of the feudal relation, the person most interested in the education of his future tenant, and thus the custody of the infant's person followed the seizure of his land. The right of marriage, at first probably confined to a veto upon the marriage of a female ward, lest an unsuitable or hostile tenant might be foisted on the lord against his will, assumed very early in our history the character of a valuable property. If the infant refused to accept a suitable person when tendered by the lord, he or she forfeited 'the value of the marriage;' that is to say, the price which could be obtained in the open market for such an alliance. Still more scandalous was the custom of disposing of the ward in marriage, which was expressly recognised by the Statute of Merton, and ceased only on the abolition of military tenures in 1660. Both the wardship and the marriage of the heir became subjects of property to be disposed of to the highest bidder, and constituted a fruitful source of revenue not only to private landowners, but even to the Crown. Thus, for example:

* John Earl of Lincoln gave Henry III. 3,000 marks to have the marriage of Richard de Clare for the benefit of Matilda, his eldest

daughter; and Simon de Montfort gave the same king 10,000 marks to have the custody of the lands and heir of Gilbert de Unfranville, until the heir's full age or the heir's marriage, and with advowsons of churches, knights' fees, and other pertinencies and escheats. Ten thousand marks containing then as much silver in weight as twenty thousand pounds now, and the value of silver in those days being unquestionably more than five times the present value, this sum was equivalent to a payment of above a hundred thousand pounds made to the Exchequer at this time.' *

Aids, reliefs, wardship and marriage, from the last two of which socage lands were exempt, by no means exhaust the catalogue of feudal exactions; but enough has been said to show that during this period the tenure of land was subject to burdens so oppressive as to excite surprise at their having been so long and so patiently borne.

In addition to the great body of freeholders, knights and socagers, there were tenants in every manor who were not free, and who occupied their lands by the precarious tenure of villenage. Records of the social condition of the lowest classes are always meagre, and it is extremely difficult to ascertain the various phases of servitude through which villeins passed in the several stages of our history. M. Glasson devotes considerable space to the examination of the subject, and with reference to the interesting question of the origin of villenage, he says:—

'Historians and jurists maintain that serfs were already very numerous among the Saxons. The Normans are supposed, indeed, to some extent to have raised them out of slavery. By including them in the feudal system, and by admitting them to the oath of fealty, the protection of the lord to whom they had been allotted was secured to them. Domesday Book, in fact, teaches us that the villeins were divided among the Norman lords. Thus Archbishop Lanfranc obtained 219 for his Manor of Mellings in Sussex. But were these Saxon-born villeins whom we find mentioned in Domesday Book as *villani*, *bordarii*, *cotarii*, freemen or slaves before the Conquest? Augustin Thierry and M. Garsonnet maintain that the Conquest of 1066 produced quite the contrary effect; and that, instead of improving the condition of the Saxon serf, it reduced the greater number of freemen to the state of villenage. Both these opinions are, I think, too absolute. The true solution consists in adopting both, freed from their exaggerations. There is no doubt that some Saxons descended in the social scale and fell into the class of villeins. . . . After the fusion, and I have already said that it was accomplished very early, the condition of the lower classes rapidly improved. The former Saxon serf doubtless profited by the Norman Conquest, which conferred upon him an improved status.' (Vol. ii. p. 236.)

* Lyttelton's 'History of Henry II.,' vol. ii. p. 296.

M. Glasson does not, we think, distinguish as clearly as might be desired between villenage and slavery; yet the distinction is not difficult to appreciate, and, moreover, is of fundamental importance in the historical aspect of this question. The slave (*servus*), like a chattel, was the absolute property of his master, and enjoyed no civil rights; the villein (*villanus*), on the contrary, as against all the world but his lord, possessed an independent status. The entire feudal system consisted of rights exercised by one class of men over those immediately beneath them, and villenage was merely the last and lowest link in the chain of personal relations. Much obscurity prevails as to the condition of the lower classes shortly after the Conquest, but we may conjecture that the effect of that social revolution was in great measure to abolish slavery, to extend villenage, and ultimately to improve the condition of the agricultural serf. Littleton, writing four centuries after the Conquest, divides villeins into two classes, villeins regardant and villeins in gross; and it is not easy to distinguish the latter from mere personal slaves. It may be presumed, however, that their number was small in comparison with that of villeins regardant, who were attached to the soil; for the lord, in claiming a villein in gross, had to establish his title by affirmative proof. This he probably seldom cared to do, and accordingly the class inevitably tended towards extinction, by merger in the more privileged class of villeins regardant. The position even of these was indeed sufficiently degraded. They could not leave the land on which they were born; whatever property they acquired their lords might seize; they were bound to perform the most menial services, and, according to Coke, had to submit to personal chastisement at the hands of their tyrants. It is clear from a passage in Littleton,* that if a lord maimed his villein, he might be indicted for the crime, but could not be made answerable in damages, for whatever the villein recovered the lord might again take from him.

The gradual abolition of villenage is a subject as curious and almost as obscure as its origin and development. That it lingered in some remote districts until the seventeenth century we know from some claims of villenage having been made in the reign of James I.; but these must have been exceptional cases, for the position of the copyholder was then well assured.

‘The state of slavery,’ says Mr. Freeman,† ‘never abolished by law, passed so utterly out of use and out of mind, that English judges who

* Littleton's ‘Tenures,’ § 194.

† History of the Norman Conquest, vol. v. p. 480.

remembered that there had been such a thing as villenage, denied that there ever had been such a thing as slavery. . . . It is characteristic of English history that slavery was finally wiped out from among us, not by a legislative enactment, but by a judicial decision which did more credit to the hearts of the judges who gave it, than it did to their knowledge of history.*

We have dwelt at some length on the social condition of the people after the introduction of feudalism, because the establishment of feudal institutions is in truth the legal history of the period. The gradual shaping of this unwritten law is a fact of the utmost importance in the subsequent history of the country, not only creating the foundation upon which the whole structure rests, but fixing the character of society and the mutual relations of its several classes, which go a long way towards determining the actual course of legislation for an indefinite time.

The reign of Henry II. is for many reasons one of the most important epochs in legal history. The fusion of Norman and English law was then complete, feudal institutions were solidly established, and custom had achieved a great part of its work in the creation of the 'common law.' Two conflicts of great constitutional interest were waged by the king throughout his reign, the one with the Church, the other with the barons, both resulting in the eventual success of the Crown. Henry himself was an ardent law reformer, and, aided by his Chief Justiciar, Glanville, the author of the first treatise on the laws of England, he introduced a complete change in the organisation of justice. It is this which makes the reign of Henry II. the starting point of modern law. The substitution of the Grand Assize for trial by battle in civil cases, and the regulation of the circuits of the judges, very nearly on their modern footing, were not only important in themselves, but also played a great part in the subsequent development of our institutions.

M. Glasson has no hesitation in ascribing to France the honour of having initiated the system of itinerant justices, but some such procedure is a necessary incident of a central government which seeks to make its power felt in remote provinces, and would spontaneously arise when a country had advanced to a certain stage of civilisation.

'The itinerant judges of England,' says M. Glasson, 'trace their origin more especially to our ancient France. They were founded in imitation of the *Missi dominici* of the Karolingians. We know that

* The case here referred to is that of James Sommersett, the negro slave, reported in the 'State Trials,' vol. xx. p. 1.

Charles the Bald divided his kingdom into twelve parts, and commissioned certain lay and clerical dignitaries to traverse each year the provinces within their jurisdiction in order to watch over the administration of justice and of the property of the Church. This was done in imitation of the *Missi dominici* of Charlemagne.' (Vol. ii. p. 339.)

The *Missi dominici*, however, in whom the author here finds the originals of our justices in eyre, exercised the functions of inspectors rather than of judges. They examined into the administration of justice by the local courts, deposed judges who failed to perform their duties, repressed abuses, and, in a word, acted under a roving commission which embraced the entire system of local government. Representing the sovereign power more than the judicial bench, they carried the eyes of the king into the remote parts of his empire. The itinerant justices, as they were systematised if not created by Henry II., performed a far more important duty. They were not functionaries occasionally despatched to superintend and to correct, but were emanations from a central court, and diffused far and wide the same principles of law, the same administrative details of procedure, as were known in Westminster; thereby contributing in no small degree to the establishment of a uniform system of jurisprudence throughout the kingdom.

We may usefully contrast with M. Glasson's unqualified statement as to the French origin of our circuits, the following remarks on the subject by the highest living authority. Canon Stubbs, it will be observed, speaks with considerable hesitation, but the tenor of his remarks is in favour of the views which we have ventured to express:---

'The provincial visitations of the royal judges, which under Henry II. grew into a regular system of judicial eyres, are less certainly Norman. They may be of Karolingian origin, as an expedient of government; but the historical connexion between the judges of Henry I. and those of Charles the Great may be traced, perhaps, with as much probability on English as on Norman ground. If the capitularies of Charles the Bald include the territory which was afterwards Normandy, in the plan for the operation of the imperial *Missi*, there is sufficient evidence that a measure of the same sort was taken in England as early as the days of Alfred. But in this point, as well as in the others, it seems more natural to suppose that similar circumstances suggested similar institutions, than that the latter were historically connected.' *

We have in the preceding pages endeavoured to trace some of the more important steps by which the unwritten or

'common' law came into existence. In the period upon which we are now about to enter the vague and intangible growth of custom is to a great extent replaced by the definite language of the Statute-book. Modern English law, it must be remembered, is mainly composed of two elements, the general principles shaped by usage and constantly repeated in ancient text-books and judicial *dicta*, and the actual innovations introduced by Acts of Parliament. The unwritten or common law, and that promulgated in the form of Statutes, belong to different epochs of our history, the former having been practically completed before the latter entered upon its long career. We cannot, indeed, assign an exact date for the termination of customary development, or for the commencement of legislation. The one fades away in the growing light of modern history, while the other, feeble at first, rapidly attains a position of paramount importance; but, speaking generally, we may take the Magna Carta of John as the dividing line between the old order and the new.

It is somewhat strange that in a subject so well defined as the code of written law the authorities should not be at one as to the Act which should stand first upon the Statute-book. In all the older collections Magna Carta, as it was granted by Henry III. in the ninth year of his reign, occupies the foremost place; but the edition known as the Statutes of the Realm, published at the beginning of this century under the authority of the Record Commissioners, places this document among the Charters of Liberties, and treats 25 Edward I. as the first authentic legislative form of the Great Charter. The earliest Roll of Parliament now extant belongs to the session of 6 Edward I., and the well-recognised Statutes of Merton, Marlborough, Westminster the First, and others, having been passed before this date, are printed from records of inferior authority.

The Great Charter of John is clearly to be regarded as a concession wrung from that weak and wicked monarch, and not as a legislative act; but it was subsequently, with but slight modifications, expressly adopted by Parliament, and therefore inaugurates the new reign of written laws. It has been well said * that the whole of the constitutional history of England is a commentary on Magna Carta; and we may add that Magna Carta is itself the best commentary on the previous state of the law. The sturdy barons who confronted their king at Runnymede did not busy their brains about abstract principles, or insert provisions restraining abuses, or prohibiting

* Stubbs, 'Select Charters,' p. 228.

exactions in cases which had never arisen. Each clause of the Charter, therefore, may be taken as a sentence of condemnation upon the prevailing practices of John and his predecessors.

M. Glasson, whose third volume borrows its title from 'The Great Charter,' describes in accurate language the position which it occupies with respect to legislation. After recounting the events which preceded the hypæthral parliament of Runnymede, he continues:—

'These circumstances explain the true nature of Magna Carta. It is not a unilateral act emanating from the sole and spontaneous will of the king, like the charters of John's predecessors. Neither is it a treaty, for we cannot say that it was concluded between two duly constituted and independent sovereign powers, or between two nations. Still less is it a law. The barons do not play the parts of subjects, for they have cast aside their promise of fealty; and the king stands vanquished before them to submit to the conditions imposed upon him by his conquerors. The Great Charter is therefore a contract, but a contract which approximates to a treaty between two nations in so far as one of the parties by virtue of the rights of war is enabled to impose its will upon the others. Moreover the Grand Charter contains penal sanctions analogous to those which are to be found in a convention with a hostile nation. The barons stipulate that if the king breaks his word, they reserve to themselves the right to seize and retain his castles, and to molest him by all the forces at their command. We see how inaccurate it would be to class the Great Charter with laws or ordinary statutes, though it eventually assumed that form. It is rather to be compared, as M. Boutmy has pointed out, to our treaty of Amboise, to our pact of Saint-Germain, to all the conventions which during the epochs of religious wars furnished guarantees to the French Protestants, placed certain towns in their hands, and constituted them almost a nation within the nation.' (Vol. iii. p. 51.)

Whatever may have been the exact legal character of Magna Carta, there can be no doubt as to its place in popular estimation. The glamour of a great victory hangs about the name, and the lapse of centuries has rather increased than diminished its prominence among the great landmarks of the past. Quite independently of its constitutional importance and far-reaching results, it stands out in bold relief as one of the most picturesque incidents of mediæval history. We have heard, indeed, of a lady who, on being shown the fresco in the lobby of the Houses of Parliament, asked the question, 'Who was Runnymede?' but such ignorance is exceptional, and even the sons of toil, whose historical horizons are bounded by their memories, have some dim perception, in repeating the name of Magna Carta, that it was gloriously connected with the liberties of England.

We still admire the wisdom which framed, and the firmness which exacted, the remarkable collection of royal promises which constitute the Great Charter; but we must also remember with gratitude the persistent vigilance of Parliament in guarding the treasure that had been won, by forcing each unwilling king to ratify or repeat the concessions of his predecessors. More than thirty times was the Charter recognised or confirmed in successive reigns, and the most scrupulous care was displayed in securing its due publication. By a confirming statute of Edward I. it was declared that it should be sent under the Great Seal to sheriffs and magistrates, and a copy lodged in every cathedral church of England, with special directions for its being read twice a year to the assembled people; and the archbishops and bishops were ordered to pronounce sentence of excommunication upon 'the breakers of the Charter.'

It was not in Magna Carta alone that the barons of England displayed their zeal and energy. Many of the statutes of the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I. furnish remarkable proofs of the same spirit, coupled with the utmost determination to uphold the privileges of their order. At this early date the secular struggle over the alienation of land entered upon its most interesting phase, and we may be pardoned for digressing at this point in order to sketch the wavering fortunes of the conflict. We are the more anxious to follow this single thread of legal history because our remarks upon the general subject of English law in later periods will be necessarily brief, and because the land question in its progress through the centuries illustrates the slow and silent revolution which has changed the feudal England of the Plantagenets into the democratic England of to-day.

According to strict feudal principles, the relations between lord and tenant were intimately personal; and the attempted substitution of a new tenant created a forfeiture of the fief. But this could not last long. The heir began to be admitted, first as a favour, then as of right. Grants were made to the tenant and his heirs, or to him and the heirs of his body; words which were interpreted by the lawyers as conferring a gift of the fee, in the one case absolutely, in the other upon condition that the first taker should have heirs of his body. The heirs, although named in the instrument, were not considered objects of gift, but were merely included in order to define the nature of the estate taken by their ancestor. When lands were conveyed to a man and the heirs of his body, he thus took what was called a fee simple conditional; and when an heir of his

body was born, the condition was satisfied, the estate became absolute, and the first taker might accordingly sell to whomsoever he pleased.*

The interests of the great landowners were by this construction injuriously affected in several important particulars. They lost the right to resume possession of the lands upon failure of the issue of the grantee; and they might be prejudiced in the recovery of the rents and services by the substitution of a worthless tenant. The facility of alienation also enabled improvident owners to break up the great family estates, and thus tended to impair the power of the feudal aristocracy. To check this growing freedom of land, the barons, in the thirteenth year of Edward I., passed the memorable statute *De Donis Conditionalibus*, which created the modern estate tail; and, in effect, reduced the 'fee simple conditional' of former times to an indefinite succession of life estates. A statutory settlement of the most rigid character was thereby secured, and the land of England seemed to be tied up for the benefit of the few until the crack of doom. Many attempts were, indeed, made by the Commons to repeal this objectionable statute, but they were invariably frustrated by the action of the nobility. For two hundred years it continued to exercise unchecked its baleful influence, and it was only in the reign of Edward IV. that freedom of alienation was restored, not by an act of the legislature, but by a decision of the judges. The case in which this decision was pronounced is known as 'Taltarum's case,' and there is no more glaring instance in the annals of our courts of judge-made law; but it was sanctioned by centuries of acquiescence, and justified by the paramount interests of society. If the space at our disposal permitted us to describe in detail the proceedings in a 'common recovery,' the matured form of Taltarum's action, our readers would be surprised at the solemn farce which so long held the boards at Westminster. For our purpose, however, it is enough to say that it was a collusive action whereby statutory rights were deliberately set aside, the entailed lands being 'recovered' by the demandant, and the disappointed issue left to their remedy against a 'man

* We shall refer to the power of alienation in the case of fee-simple estates later on. Even as against the heir the tenant of land had not in early times a complete power of alienation. But in the reign of Henry III., as we learn from the treatise of Bracton, the heir was at the mercy of his ancestor: 'Nihil acquirit ex donatione factâ antecessori, quia cum donatorio non est feoffatus.'—Bracton, lib. ii. c. 6, fol. 17.

‘of straw,’ who was in general the crier of the court. This piece of judicial trickery continued to be the scandal of our procedure until fifty years ago, when the first reformed Parliament inaugurated the system of common-sense conveyancing by abolishing Fines and Recoveries, and substituting a simple disentailing deed for the cumbrous and expensive process formerly required. But long before this beneficial change had been introduced other expedients had been adopted for the purpose of ‘settling’ land. A statute of the reign of Henry VII.* prohibited the alienation by women of estates tail derived from their husbands. When, therefore, a marriage settlement was desirable, all that was necessary to be done was to limit the lands of the husband to him and his wife, and the heirs of the body of the wife by the husband. Neither parent alone could, without the consent of the issue, defeat the estates so created; but, since both together could effectually bar the entail, this furnished but an indifferent protection to the children. It was not till the period of the Restoration that the modern settlement, with its complex limitations, was made an effective reality by the invention of ‘trustees to preserve contingent remainders.’ This device, which has been attributed to Sir Orlando Bridgman, ‘the Father of Conveyancers,’ rendered the estates of the unborn children indestructible by fine or recovery. The great families were once more triumphant in the conflict, and the land was again, by means of strict settlements, removed from the category of saleable commodities. When the eldest son came of age a re-settlement was almost invariably executed; and thus, from generation to generation, the broad acres were retained in the same family. Powers of sale, now never omitted, were in the eighteenth century never inserted; and if, for any reason, it became desirable to sell, a private Act of Parliament had to be obtained at enormous expense. At length, in 1856, a general Act was passed† which enabled the Court of Chancery, after numerous formalities, to authorise sales of settled estates; and in the session of 1882 the last step was taken towards freedom of land by an Act which, theoretically at all events, has brought every settled estate within sound of the hammer. This has been achieved by the Settled Land Act, which confers upon every tenant for life or other ‘limited owner’ power, of which he cannot be deprived, to sell the property in any manner he pleases.

Having traced in outline the progress of the law of settle-

* 11 Hen. VII. c. 20.

† The Leases and Sales of Settled Estates Act, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 120.

ment from the reign of Edward I. to the present day, from a statutory perpetuity to a statutory power of sale, we must now refer to the power of alienation possessed by tenants in fee simple. Strange as it sounds to modern ears, there was a time when such a tenant could not transfer his interest to another without the consent of his lord. Before the reign of Edward I., however, not only had this right of transfer been established, but also a custom had sprung up of subletting in fee simple the whole or part of the land, so as to create a feudal tenure between the former tenant and his under-tenant. When we remember that it was only the *immediate* lord of a tenant in actual possession who could claim the valuable incidents of escheat, wardship, and marriage, we perceive how seriously the interests of the great barons must have been compromised by this practice of *subinfeudation*. In order to put an end to this encroachment on their rights, the important statute of *Quia emptores* was passed by the Parliament of 18 Edward I. The main object of this statute was to prohibit *subinfeudation*; but, as a set-off against this restriction, it recognised and confirmed the right of sale. It enacted that it should be lawful for every freeman at his pleasure to sell his land or part thereof, so nevertheless that the purchaser should hold the land of the same chief lord, and by the same services and customs, as his feoffor held it before the sale. Thus, while it abolished the possibility of creating any new tenure in fee simple, this statute authorised that freedom of sale which has ever since formed an inseparable incident of such an estate.

Our attention has so far been chiefly engaged by the origin and development of the land laws, which must at all times occupy an important place in the code of civil rights. Their importance, however, relatively to other branches of law, has diminished with the advance of civilisation and the growth of other industries. At the present day the statutes and decided cases upon real property law represent but an insignificant fraction of the work done by the legislature and the courts; but in early times land was almost the only thing worth having, and actions about land furnished the principal occupation of the judges. It is only in the fourteenth century that trade begins to share with agriculture in the employment of the people; and then, for the first time, does commercial legislation appear prominently on the Statute-book.

So early, indeed, as the reign of Athelstan, merchants received some encouragement from the law,* and Magna Carta,

* The laws of Athelstan enact that 'if a merchant thrived so that

in the interests of commerce, provided for the safety of aliens who came to buy and sell within the realm. But the trade of the kingdom was insignificant in amount, and was chiefly confined to the export of unmanufactured wool.

English commerce and manufactures may be said to have originated in the reign of Edward III. Several external causes—the invention of the compass, the consequent facility of maritime intercourse, and the general progress of European trade—no doubt contributed to this result; but it must also be in part ascribed to the gradual decay of feudal institutions, and the increased value of ‘moveable’ property. It is indeed hard to say whether this was ‘a cause or a consequence,’ but we incline to believe that greater security brought about enhanced value, which in its turn stimulated the energies of men to labour for what, by the change in society, had become wealth. So little was personal property originally regarded in this light, that until this period the chattels of an intestate were abandoned to the ordinary, and were frequently applied by him in ‘pious uses,’ without much regard to the claims of creditors or next-of-kin.* To remedy this abuse a statute (31 Edw. III. c. 11) was passed, whereby it was enacted that the ordinary should ‘depute the next and most lawful friends of the dead person intestate to administer his goods;’ and ever since these administrators have continued to represent the deceased in all dealings with his personal estate.

The most conclusive proof of the rising importance of ‘personalty’ is furnished by the fact that in the fourteenth century the taxation of this kind of property became, as a parliamentary grant, a recognised source of supply. In M. Glasson’s interesting chapter on taxes at this period,† he gives a very complete account of the various sources of royal revenue; and says, in treating the subject of subsidies, that they were first imposed under Henry II. on the occasion of the Crusades. It was, however, only in the eighth year of the reign of Edward III. that the amount which any subsidy would produce became determinate; the assessment of the districts, boroughs, and cities being then for the first time permanently inscribed on the registers of the Exchequer.

Laws are themselves subject to the operation of an inflexible law, and legislation invariably follows the changes in society.

he thrice fared over the wide sea by his own means, then was he thenceforth of thane-right worthy.’—Thorpe’s ‘Ancient Laws,’ p. 81.

* See M. Glasson’s remarks on this subject, tom. iv. p. 307.

† Vol. iv. p. 307.

The Statute-book is itself the best indication of the current in which the national energy is directed. The reign of Edward III. is a conspicuous example of this. The commerce of the country increases, and instantly the Parliament pours forth a flood of Acts, many of them ludicrous in their policy, but all showing that the great business of the country is henceforward to be conducted on a totally new system. These early legislators were ultra-protectionists, and carried protection to such an extent that it is difficult for us to imagine how trades survived the treatment. By the Statute of the Staple,* the sale of the principal articles of commerce—wool, leather, and lead—was confined to a few large towns; the harbours of export were also specified, a port-town being appropriated to each inland staple-town. It was a capital felony for an Englishman to engage, directly or indirectly, in the export trade; and the foreign merchants, who were alone permitted to transport their goods out of the realm, were bound by an oath 'to hold no staple beyond the sea of the same merchandises.'

It is difficult to follow the train of thought which prompted such ridiculous enactments; but the key is probably supplied by an earlier statute of the same reign, which sought to restrain the exportation of the precious metals. By this statute † it was ordained that 'no religious man, nor other, shall carry any sterling out of the Realm of England;' and to give practical effect to this provision, it was also enacted that hostlers in every port should be sworn to search their guests, and that pilgrims, upon pain of a year's imprisonment, 'were to pass beyond the sea by Dover alone.'

In the interest of home manufactures it was provided ‡ that no one, except the king, queen, and their children, should wear foreign cloth, the importation of which was absolutely prohibited. The commercial legislation of the time, however, was not all of this puerile character. Encouragement was given to the discontented weavers of Flanders to settle in this country, whose superior skill was soon communicated to the English handicraftsmen. Uniformity in weights and measures was a frequent subject of Parliamentary interference; and a convenient procedure was introduced by the Statute of the Staple, to which we have already referred, for the regulation and enforcement of contracts between merchants.

From this feeble beginning the mercantile law of England has since developed into a stupendous code; and its progress

* 27 Edw. III. st. 2.

† 9 Edw. III. st. 2.

‡ 11 Edw. III. c. 2..

illustrates, better than any other branch of law, the close connexion between statutes and social institutions. Before the time of Edward III. the people had few wants, and no luxuries, whose trade was accordingly confined to articles of extreme simplicity. But the restless invention of man would not suffer society to stagnate. New tastes were formed by foreign intercourse, and for their gratification countless branches of industry arose, which in their turn supplied new subjects of statutory regulation. Shipping, railways, banks, joint-stock companies, insurance, and many other subjects, more or less closely related to trade, have each of them given rise to a library of law. So multiform is modern commerce that, in comparison with its primitive simplicity, it resembles the highly differentiated organism which has developed from a single cell. We may, without extravagance, carry the similitude still further, and compare the all-pervading system of law to the network of nerves, which have grown with the growth of the frame, and control every movement of the complicated machine.

Many other examples of laws called into existence by the progress of society are furnished by the Parliamentary records of every session. A wider knowledge of the causes of disease has brought 'Public Health' within the range of law; a fuller comprehension of the evil of ignorance has placed an Education Code upon the Statute-book; the distribution of light and water to the closely packed inhabitants of our cities can be practically effected only under the sanction of Acts of Parliament. The discoveries of science require constant legislation. The application of steam to locomotion has created more law and fed more lawyers than any other subject in the range of experience. A loop of platinum wire is made to glow in a vacuum bulb, and straightway an Electric Lighting Act makes its appearance. In an evil hour the chemist treats glycerine with nitric acid, and the lives of men require statutory protection against the fortuitous compound. In these cases social change has manifestly preceded and necessitated legislation. They are, it is true, only instances, but they are typical instances; and they suffice to illustrate a point of some importance in the theory of the origin of law, viz. that statutes, which derive their efficacy from the sovereign power of the State, are in reality the outcome of subtle and complex changes in the framework of society, and furnish a running commentary on the moral, intellectual, and material life of the people. To trace back the laws to their origin is one of the most difficult tasks which the legal historian is called upon to perform; but it is also, perhaps, one of

the most important; for, as Montesquieu has felicitously observed, 'il faut éclairer les lois par l'histoire, et l'histoire par les lois.'

English law is divided by some writers into common law and statute law; but this is by no means an exhaustive classification, for there remains a third source which, from day to day, reinforces

'The lawless science of our law,
That codeless myriad of precedent,
That wilderness of single instances.'

The decisions of the judges fill hundreds of volumes, and practically regulate the rights of suitors in subsequent cases for which a precedent can be found. Yet it is only in a limited sense that they can be classed as *laws*, since they neither are, nor profess to be, in their origin, legislative acts, but are merely declaratory of the law in the particular case before the court. Many judgments, however, may be logically dissected, so as to separate the enunciation of principle from the facts to which it is to be applied. When such a judgment is pronounced by a court of competent authority, when, moreover, the principle forms the basis of the actual decision, and is not merely enunciated as a *dictum*, a rule of law is obtained which, being independent of detail, is capable of general application. It is only to this extent that decided cases have any binding force, and, in the character of precedents, assume the power of laws over courts of inferior or, after the lapse of time, of co-ordinate jurisdiction. Closely connected with the subject of judicial decisions, but of still greater importance as a source of law, is the equitable jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery. This jurisdiction, which has, in the result, triumphed over the narrow and technical system of the common law, occupied for centuries so large a space in our legal annals, that we must devote the few pages remaining at our disposal to a brief account of its origin and progress.

The chancellor was, even in Saxon times, an official of considerable dignity, and under the Norman kings his functions became more varied, and his power progressively increased. Like other great functionaries of the household, he occupied a seat in the *Curia Regis*; as keeper of the Royal Seal he had to authenticate all grants and charters; while, as secretary to the king, he became familiar with his most private affairs. In the reign of Henry III., when the Chief Justiciary of all England was shorn of his splendour, the chancellor became the second personage in the kingdom, and his salary exceeded that of any other judge.* When the three great courts of

* Even allowing for the difference in the value of money, the

common law had been evolved out of and finally separated from the Great Council, a large quantity of legislative and judicial work continued to be transacted by the latter. These various matters were brought before the king in council in the form of petitions, and when their number increased, as it did in the reign of Edward III., it became usual to refer them to the department conversant with the subject-matter of each petition. To the chancellor, a grave and learned ecclesiastic, the petitions relating to 'grace and favour' were naturally referred for report and decision; and to this practice must be ascribed the origin of that equitable jurisdiction which was destined to develop in after times into the High Court of Chancery.

Lord Campbell considers that 'the chancellor's equitable jurisdiction is as indubitable and as ancient as his common law jurisdiction,'* but in this opinion he differs from all other authorities; and it is beyond question that, although in early times he may have occasionally granted relief in cases of hardship, it was towards the end of the reign of Edward III. that his powers were systematically exercised upon petitions presented directly to himself. In the next reign we find indignant protests on the part of the Commons against the encroachments of the chancellor; and this in itself is sufficient to prove that his jurisdiction had then recently entered upon a novel career. We are not, however, left to conjecture upon this point; for we can place with certainty in this reign the origin of the writ of *subpœna*, which placed inquisitorial power in the hands of the chancellor.

Equity as a distinct system would never have acquired the position that it did without the aid of an invention to which we must now refer, and which probably dates from the same reign of Richard II. We allude to the mode of conveying lands to *uses*, whereby the legal interest was vested in one person, and the beneficial enjoyment reserved for another. The *feoffee to uses* was in the position of a trustee, and was bound in conscience not to avail himself of his legal powers in a manner subversive of his trust. The equitable interference of the chancellor was probably first exercised in connexion with these *uses* of land, the origin of which is thus explained by M. Glasson:—

chancellor's salary will not, according to modern notions, be regarded as excessive. According to the *Liber Niger*, this great officer of State received five shillings a day, three cakes, three pints of wine, one large candle, and forty candle-ends.'—Glasson, vol. iii. p. 267.

* Lives of the Chancellors, i. p. 7.

‘In order to obtain unauthorised grants of land, the clergy had adopted the expedient of applying the Roman system of *fidei commissa* to alienations which they wished to be made in their favour. Instead of conveying directly to them, the donor transferred the property to a third person, but for the use of such or such a monastery. This new method of conveyance was introduced in England towards the end of the reign of Edward III. The new nominal owner, like the *fiduciarius* of the Roman law, was owner only so far as to hand on to the religious house all the benefits of the acquisition. In law he was owner, but in equity the chancellor, who was at this time taken from the ranks of the clergy, usurping the powers of the Roman prætor, decided that this owner was a trustee, and compelled him to fulfil the obligations by which he was bound in conscience towards his *cestui-que trust*. These frauds were repressed by a statute of Richard II. Alienations made in this form to mortmain establishments without license were annulled among the rest. But this new mode of alienation was incorporated in the civil law, and there even underwent very considerable development. It opened the way, in fact, for circumventing the rigour of the feudal law, and avoiding the danger of confiscation so common in these times of civil war.’ (Vol. iv. p. 254.)

The trustee constituted in the manner described in this extract might evidently act in contravention of his trust either by detaining the land in his possession, or by proceeding in a court of common law to recover it by the strength of his legal title. The chancellor was prepared for both these contingencies. For the former a *subpœna* was devised, calling upon the trustee to answer upon oath as to his trust: the latter was effectually prevented by an injunction prohibiting the plaintiff at law from proceeding with his action. This assumption of jurisdiction was not regarded with favour by the courts of law. The chancellor was invariably an ecclesiastic, and as such a canonist and a civilian. From Sir John Knyvet to Sir Thomas More, a period of nearly one hundred and fifty years, no lawyer held the seals. We may assume, therefore, that in this critical period the Court of Chancery was ignorant of, or at least hostile to, the principles of feudal law; and that its encroachments were regarded with jealous distrust by the courts over which it assumed supremacy. Conflicts between the two jurisdictions were not uncommon, and though the chancellor might commit for breach of an injunction, the King’s Bench could release the prisoner by a writ of *habeas corpus*. Sir Thomas More, it is said, used to regale the common law judges at dinner, and ‘across the walnuts and the wine’ convince them of the propriety of his injunctions. The celebrated dispute between Sir Edward Coke, Chief Justice of the King’s Bench, and Lord Ellesmere, the Chancellor, as to

the interference of equity with judgments at law, shows that, so late as the reign of James I., the position of the Court of Chancery had not been definitively established. To Sir Heneage Finch, afterwards Earl of Nottingham, who held the seals from 1673 to 1682, the credit undoubtedly belongs of having made equity a separate branch of English jurisprudence, and of having so defined its limits as to render impossible for the future any unseemly squabble with the courts of common law.

Nothing more extraordinary can be found in the legal history of any country than the co-existence for centuries of conflicting jurisdictions whereby at one side of Westminster Hall a plaintiff might recover judgment, and at the other, in the character of defendant, be restrained by injunction from putting his judgment in force. This anomaly has in recent years been abolished by the amalgamation of the courts, but at least one generation of lawyers and judges must pass away before the evils of the double system shall have been completely eradicated. At the beginning of the present year the courts entered upon a new and important phase of their existence. For the first time since the reign of John the dissociated elements of the *Curia Regis* were then re-united both in jurisdiction and in session. The Royal Courts of Justice are not separated by a wider difference from the primitive simplicity of the *Aula Regia* than that which divides the systems of law administered at these two epochs of history. Yet the one has by a slow process of organic growth been developed from the other. No violent revolution, no foreign interference, has in the meantime uprooted any of our institutions. They have moulded themselves to suit the exigencies of a progressive society; and the history of law, as the exponent of social change, is perhaps what enables us most fully to realise this orderly development of our national life.

- ART. V.—1. *Bibliotheca Piscatoria*, a Catalogue of Books on Angling, the Fisheries, and Fish-culture. By T. WEST WOOD and T. SATCHELL. London: 1883.
2. *Bibliotheca Ichthyologica et Piscatoria*. By D. M. BOSGOED. Haarlem: 1874.
3. *Angling Literature*. By OSMUND LAMBERT. London: 1881.
4. *A History of British Fresh-water Fishes*. By the Rev. W. HOUGHTON, M.A., F.L.S. Illustrated with a Coloured Drawing of each Species, and numerous Engravings. 2 vols. 4to. London: 1883.

THANKS to such good work as has already been done by the Index and Folk-lore Societies, and especially by the Conference of Librarians at their annual meetings, bibliography within the last few years has rapidly assumed the proportions both of an art and of a science. As a science, it accurately describes books; as an art, it teaches, first, how to catalogue and arrange books in the most convenient order for reference, and then applies these principles to the various divisions and heads under which the literature of a country falls. The bibliographer is necessarily somewhat of a drudge; but so is the lexicographer. If the world is not sufficiently grateful to them, at least it cannot, at a late period of a nation's literature, exist without their toilsome devotion. Fortunately the perpetual discovery and cataloguing of new works and editions produces in the bibliographer's otherwise serene soul something akin to the pleasing excitement engendered by field-sports in their votaries. His mind is ever in a flutter with expectation. Sweet hope sits by him. A hunt through a foreign library, or permission to explore the annals of some venerable religious house, may at any moment disclose treasures of priceless value. Who can forget the sensations excited by the discovery of the bibliographic rarity of the Sunderland sale, Botticelli's designs for the *Trionfi* of Petrarca—and that actually on the morning of the auction? Besides the gratification which his own entrancing occupation affords him, the bibliographer is sensible that he is earning unbounded gratitude from scholars, inasmuch as he is providing them, in the most convenient form, materials for the prosecution of their own studies. Thus the bibliographer is twice blest; and,

* This book fetched 1,950*l.*, and is now in the British Museum.

to one consumed by a genuine love of his science, the monotonous toil of eye and pen, the sacred dust of centuries which he disturbs, the close confinement of musty libraries among moths and book-worms, the perils incident to his vocation (was not Martin Routh lamed by a folio, while it is conceivable that he might have been brained by it?)—all these are esteemed as nothing compared with the monograph or ‘*Systema*’ which will result from his labours and render his name famous to all who have occasion to apply themselves to the researches which he has catalogued. In the nature of things, too, his toils never come to an end. They resemble Penelope’s web, or the ropes of sand which Thomas the Rhymer ordered his familiar to twist. Before his catalogue is printed, more works bearing upon the subject will have issued from the press; before it can reach the reader’s hands, it will need a supplement. Happy, then, above all others, is the lot of the bibliographer. The bibliophile may buy rare books for the scholar to read, but books in general are the all-absorbing object in life of the bibliographer, and instead of their insides all he need know of them in general may be read on their backs; if he attempts to read their pages, he is undone.

‘His study—with what authors is it stored?
In books, not authors, cunning is my lord;
To all their dated backs he turns you round,
These Aldus printed, those De Sueil has bound.’

He has books always in his hands. He is brought into the most confidential relations with them. The older he grows the sweeter does his work become. Should his years equal those of Epimenides or Methuselah, his task is yet unfinished. He will enjoy that supreme pleasure to the enthusiastic worker of dying in harness.

In our forefathers’ libraries books were often arranged in piles, one volume upon another, the faces being towards the beholder, and a ticket fronted him over the face of the book, giving all needful particulars of subject, author, and the like. A trace of this fashion remains, if memory does not play us false, in the books on which the bust of Accepted Frewen is placed in York Cathedral.* Although the charms of morocco and gilt ornamentation which at present so greatly endear books to their possessors would by this method of arrangement

* The books in the old library of Grantham Church were placed on the shelves with their fronts instead of their backs outside, their names being written in large characters on the edges of the leaves (N. & Q., 6th series, vi. 258).

be lost, the task of the bibliographer would be lightened. He could take in his stock at a glance. Perhaps a plan of this character will be elaborated at some future Conference of Librarians. Indeed a literary cynic, as he contemplates the hundreds of thousands of volumes contained in the great libraries of the country, and reflects on the enormous accessions annually made to our literature, as revealed by the publishers' catalogues, to say nothing of the mass of foreign literature which is added to their shelves, may well speculate whether all the reading which will be possible *seris nepotibus* will not possess a bibliographical tinge of the encyclopædic, in the sense of knowing something of the available sources of information on every subject. Fortunate indeed, and to be counted on the fingers, will be those English authors who are read, say, a century hence.

It speaks much for the extreme popularity of angling as a recreation among us that no other sport possesses so large a literature, and can boast of such excellent bibliographies. The activity of the seventeenth century, indeed, in producing treatises on falconry, such as Bert, Latham, Turberville, and the like, is the nearest parallel to the constant stream of books on angling which has issued from the press since the memorable book of Izaak Walton.* And of all the sportive sciences none, save perhaps that of chess, is so naturally fitted with a bibliography. The angler is proverbially gentle, scholarly, contemplative. If blessed with sufficient leisure and a long purse, he can put his art in practice more or less in our islands throughout the year. From grayling in the winter months he may turn to the spring salmon-fishing, which opens with February, in Loch Tay, and then fall back for summer upon trout. This will ensure him fly-fishing for the four seasons. Should he prefer the coarser delights of worm and livebait fishing, pike, perch, and our plebeian fresh-water fish can be captured more or less at every season which is not forbidden by Mr. Mundella's bill. Stormy days, however, must be expected, and these will drive the most enthusiastic fisherman from the water's edge. In the long nights of winter, too, the more scholarly side of his craft is necessarily evoked, its literary and philosophic aspects. Seated in the broad window of

* An excellent *catalogue raisonné* of all works relating to falconry in Greek, Latin, French, German, and a dozen other languages, will be found in the 'Traité de Fauconnerie' of Schlegel and Wulverhorst (Leyden and Düsseldorf, 1844-53). It has not, however, been brought up to the present date.

his study or by the fireside, the angler loves to nurse his mature wisdom with books, the oldest and best that have been written on his favourite science.* He is indeed to be envied if he possesses in the original editions many of the older treatises written by past worthies of the science, such books, for example, as those of Dame Juliana Berners; Leonard Mascall and Sir Hugh Plat in the next century; Blome, Du Bartas, and Markham, in the seventeenth century; or, to come nearer to our own day, 'The Songs of the Edinburgh Angling Club.' For no class of books is so eagerly bought up as those relating to fish and fishing—none sooner go out of print. It makes no difference with the vast body of collectors whether its style and matter be admirable or worthless. A book of angling, especially if it be quaintly illustrated, *meret æra Sotius*, and delights a large circle of anglers. For a love of angling grows old with, and never dies save with, its devotee. A book on his favourite amusement holds its place on his shelves even when neighbours of more literary worth are weeded out. After its owner's death it is almost always retained by son or executor when the rest of the library comes under the auctioneer's hammer. Many booksellers now give a prominent place to, or issue separate lists of, angling works. They are in great request with second-hand dealers; and at least one worthy octogenarian bookseller on the outskirts of London devotes his space and care solely to works on fishing, gratifying a large number of angling book-lovers by the volumes which he collects for them.

Habent sua fata libelli; what would we not give for the russet-covered, isabelline-coloured pages of many a little angling book which was carried in an ancestor's pocket to the stream, or which was negligently tossed upon the window-seat of some summer parlour among books on farriery and coat-armour long since forgotten! Too seldom do such treasures turn up at the present day, when all the world collects. With much delight we take from its niche a prize of our own, a tiny 24mo, 'Printed for G. Conyers, at the Ring, in 'Little Britain,' about 1712, and compiled by the industrious Gervase Markham: 'The Young Sportsman's Delight and 'Instructor in Angling, Fowling, Hawking, Hunting, ordering 'Singing Birds, Hawks, Poultry, Conies, Hares, Dogs, &c.' It also contains many marvels of credulity with regard to baits,

* See a pleasant paper in *Cambridge Essays*, 1856, by Mr. H. R. Francis, 'The Fly-fisher and his Library.' It is somewhat circumscribed, however, and does not take note of many great names in fly-fishing literature.

'oils and ointments exceeding the oil of osprey,' and the like, while the frontispiece is made up of five rude representations of fish and of the ideal angler. The first edition cost sixpence in 1652. This second edition is worth at least as many pounds. Our own copy possesses double claims to its owner (inasmuch as it has lost its title-page), on much the same principle that parents who receive a son from service abroad are unusually proud should he have lost a limb in his country's behalf. We comfort ourselves, too, with the knowledge that only one perfect copy of the book is now known, which is in the Denison Collection. Hope always whispers to the devotee of angling treatises that among the lumber of some dingy pawnbroker's shop, in an old-world farmhouse, or among a casual lot of tattered volumes put up for sale with the effects of a deceased country parson, some unlooked-for treasure may be purchased for a few pence. Such a discovery, when it does come, is one of those fearful joys known to all bibliomaniacs.

To all collectors a guide is indispensable. Much gratitude is due from every scholarly angler to those laborious slaves, the cataloguers of angling books. We possess a goodly number of these lists in the vulgar tongue. The following comprise the chief of them:—Sir H. Ellis in 1811 was the first to draw up a list of books devoted to this fascinating art. It was originally inserted in the '*British Biographer*,' and contained twenty-one pages which registered seventy-five distinct angling works in order of publication. Less than sixty detached copies were struck off; but it was appended (without acknowledgment) to Daniels's '*Rural Sports*' in 1813. Boosey added to his '*Piscatorial Reminiscences*' (Pickering, 1835) an enlarged list founded on that of Sir H. Ellis. He collected the titles of one hundred and eighty works. In 1856 Mr. J. Russell Smith published a further list extending over two hundred and sixty-four entries. Bethune, an American biographer, in his '*Waltonian Library*' (1847), appended to his first edition—which was also the first American edition—of Walton's '*Compleat Angler*,' a list comprising some three hundred entries. Meanwhile, in 1840, James Wilson (brother of the more celebrated Professor Wilson of '*Noctes*' fame) had published 'a list of books on angling,' running to about a hundred volumes, between his two treatises on '*The Rod and the Gun*.'*

* Black, 1840. The same Wilson wrote '*A Voyage round the Coasts of Scotland and the Isles*,' which may yet be read with pleasure by the tourist and angler.

It was reserved for Mr. T. Westwood, a veteran both with pen and fishing-rod, to put together in 1861 'A New Bibliotheca Piscatoria; or a General Catalogue of Angling and Fishing Literature with Biographical Notes and Dates.' In this little volume (which has long been out of print), the collector for the first time found any useful approximation to the treasures which might be claimed by his craft. It included eighty-two pages of entries, and was a great advance upon its predecessors. Still, too much in it was taken upon trust from the lists of previous compilers, and no rigid supervision was exercised over titles which were admitted. The estimation in which it was held by literary anglers only showed what need there was for a fuller and more accurate edition. Mr. Estcourt has recently contributed a useful article on 'The Bibliography of Angling' to the first series of 'Anglers' Evenings,' the records of the Manchester Angling Club.* This exhibits considerable independent research. The whole field of angling literature was also surveyed by Mr. O. Lambert in a pleasant little book published in 1881.†

For many of his entries on classical and even general works about angling, Mr. Westwood, as had indeed been the case with his predecessors, was more or less indebted to the labours of several European scholars. Kreysig‡ in 1750 had industriously put together a list of all ancient writers on hunting, fowling, and fishing. This book naturally formed a useful quarry for successors in the same field. Engelmann§ continued it. But the palm must be given to Bosgoed over all who have contended in the continental lists. His book is painstaking, accurate, comprehensive, and has in its turn, like Aaron's rod swallowing up the serpents of the Egyptian magicians, with true international courtesy, assimilated the whole of Mr. Westwood's 'Bibliotheca Piscatoria.' Bosgoed's compilation is especially useful to ichthyologists, containing as it does the title of every known book on the history of the fishes of every country of the world. It is an excellent specimen of the perfection to which German perseverance will carry out a bibliographical inquiry, and by its exhaustive character may well stir up the emulation of our own scholars. A second edition, we hear, is in preparation, and this will be

* Manchester: Heywood.

† Angling Literature. Sampson Low & Sons.

‡ G. C. Kreysig, 'Bibliotheca Scriptorum Venaticorum,' &c., Altenburgi.

§ W. Engelmann, 'Bibliotheca Historico-Naturalis,' Leipzig, 1843. See especially p. 431 (books on Ichthyology).

awaited with impatience by all who have used the first. Professor Brown Goode, of the Smithsonian Institute and the United States Fisheries Commission, has for years been compiling a most elaborate bibliography of ichthyology, fisheries, and fish-culture, which will be highly valued on both sides of the Atlantic.

In the meantime an admirable substitute has been recently produced by Messrs. Satchell and Westwood, a second edition of the latter's '*Bibliotheca Piscatoria*,' which from the number of entries it contains, the extreme care which has been bestowed upon their correctness, and the piquant bibliographical notes appended to many of the titles, is really a new work, and one indispensable as a companion to the angler blessed (and so doubly blessed) with scholarly tastes. He can now survey with facility the many distinguished authors who have treated of the—we had almost said divine—art of angling from the thirteenth century until the present year, and assess the wealth of prose and verse which has crystallised round the simple fisherman with his angle. In this accumulation of literary treasure England may well be proud when she looks at the number and excellence of the books written by her sons. Thus the '*Bibliotheca Piscatoria*' forms, as it were, a hagiology of angling for the enthusiastic follower of Walton. But it is more; it is a substantial help to the bibliographer; a series of finger-posts planted by the side of English history to guide the curious student of diversions which found favour with our forefathers; an amusement which the idle angler can look through as he notes the names of those distinguished of old in his craft; a veritable delight to the scholarly angler. It fills a void which had long been a subject for lament, as it will instruct him in the editions, rarity, &c. of the books which he may desire for his library. Best of all it is a trustworthy companion to the practical angler of the present day in finding the books which treat of fishing in the particular district which he may be about to visit. On all these accounts, everyone in the least degree connected with what Walton terms 'my honest humble art' will receive this boon from Messrs. Westwood and Satchell with gratitude. 3,158 editions and reprints of 2,148 distinct works are registered by them. 2,465 of these have been personally inspected, 1,685 in the Denison Collection, 482 in the British Museum, and 348 in other libraries of the metropolis. The Parliamentary papers on fish and fishing which have been included amount to 727, together with the titles of 341 Acts of Parliament.* These particulars will give some idea of the

* See postscript, end of Preface to *Bib. Pisc.* p. xii.

labour necessary for this compilation and of the richness of its details.

Aided by this careful bibliography we purpose in the first place to take a brief survey of the chief books on angling which have issued from the printing press during each of the last four centuries. Many of these are of extreme rarity, not a few of great interest either from their own intrinsic merits or from some secondary cause endearing them to the scholarly angler. Save in some such unique collection of books on angling as Mr. Denison possesses, which mounts up to 3,000 volumes, it is very difficult to examine the rarer works. The collector may sigh almost hopelessly for many of the most celebrated early books on angling. A copy of Dame Juliana Berners's 'Boke,' for instance, has only appeared twice in an auction-room this century. It was naturally secured last year by that unconquerable purchaser Mr. B. Quaritch, but at the cost of 600 guineas. Mr. Denison has since secured the second copy for 450*l*. Not the most sanguine picker-up of rarities can so much as conceive it possible that another copy of this charming black-letter volume should ever again be hawked up and down the country for a few shillings, as was the case with the copy whose fortunes are told in Mr. Blades's delightful 'Enemies of Books.' Some of the scarcest angling works, however, have of late years been reprinted by photographic processes, so that no one need be ignorant of their contents. It is with much pleasure we note that 'J. D.'s' admirable poetry on fishing, of which four editions were printed between 1613 and 1652, has been made accessible by Mr. Arber in the first volume of his 'English Garner' (1877).

The oldest English treatise on fishing is contained in the Colloquy of the Saxon Ælfric. The so-called original MS. of the tenth century in the Cottonian Library is of course but a transcript from an earlier one which is lost. Professor Skeat has recently published an English translation of this curious piece from the Latin with its interlinear Anglo-Saxon.* This Colloquy is valueless, so far as matter is concerned, but its form is singular. It was originally intended to give some knowledge of Latin, and is vapid enough to our digestion. 'What craft do you exercise?' asks the Master; and P. (Puer or Piscator) replies—

'I am a fisher.

'M. What do you get by your craft?

'P. Victuals, clothes, and money.

* Angler's Note Book (Satchell), 1880, pp. 76, 155, &c.

‘*M.* How do you catch fish ?

‘*P.* I get into my boat, and cast my nets into the river, and throw out my angle [hook] and my rods, and whatever they catch I take.’

The real value of this Colloquy, however, consists in its list of fishes, both those of fresh and of salt water. Mr. Skcat has commented on these from a philological point of view, and his lucubrations contain much that is interesting to the philosophic angler.

Rare indeed is the first European tract on angling, the ‘*Boecxken*’ printed by Mattheus Van der Goes, probably in 1492. It contains twenty-six chapters of a few lines each, giving recipes for artificial baits and the like, and is in black letter. A much earlier record of the different modes of fishing with worm, fly, torch and spear, night-lines, &c., is contained in R. de Fournival’s ‘*De Vetula*,’* attributed to the thirteenth or fourteenth century. This existed in manuscript until 1861, when it was printed by Aubry. The poem was formerly ascribed to Ovid, but anyone who looks into the latter poet’s ‘*Halicutica*’ (of which, however, we only possess a fragment) will see that the Latin poet knew nothing of fly-fishing. Mr. Chatto was, we believe, the first to point out the earliest mention of fly-fishing by the classical authors, in a very curious passage in the 15th Book of *Ælian*’s ‘*History of Animals*.’ The only other book on angling known to collectors in this century is the celebrated treatise of Dame Juliana Berners or plain ‘*Mrs. Barnes*,’ as Mr. Blades would have it written. Manuscript copies of this book are not uncommon in the greater libraries, but all the printed editions are more or less rare. The same fate seems to overtake even reprints. It is not surprising that Haslewood’s edition of 1810 is scarce, as he only printed 150 copies; but Pickering’s pretty little reprint of 1827 has long been unattainable, and ere long Mr. Stock’s reprint of 1880 seems likely to fall under the same category. For beauty and accuracy the attention of antiquarian readers should here be directed to it. The ‘*Treatyse on Fysshynge wyth an Angle*’ is not found in the first edition of the ‘*Boke of St. Alban’s*.’ It was first printed by Wynkyn de Worde at Westminster in 1496.

A few books, also of considerable rarity, occur in the sixteenth century, which most anglers make their first acquaintance with in the pages of Izaak Walton. Dubravius, Bishop of Olmutz, is one of these. He wrote in 1552 on fishponds and stews, the first of a long line of authors on the same subject.

* For both these books, see Westwood and Satchell, sub voc.

Conrad Heresbach succeeded him in 1570 with his four books on rustic occupations. One of these treats of fishing, and has been translated by Mr. Westwood.* Leonard Mascall's 'Booke of Fishing with Hooke and Line,' a quaint black-letter quarto of 1590, among sundry receipts whereby to take 'polcats, buzards, rattes, and mice,' contains much of the 'treatyse' in the 'Boke of St. Alban's,' the first of the many thefts of the kind which the student of angling literature continually notices.

It is in the seventeenth century, however, that the stream of angling books first wells forth from the heart of rustic England, and has ever since continued to flow with a full current. Besides Walton, Colonel Venables, and C. Cotton, the patriarchs of the art, Barker, Chetham, Nobbes, and Gervase Markham flourished, their books being still in request, several of them having passed through many editions. The Laureate of the craft, as he has been called, J. D. (i.e. John Dennys), also belongs to this age. His verses are still fresh and sweet, and his sentiments gracious and elevating, so that they are yet read with pleasure. The 'divine du Bartas,' translated into English by Sylvester, 1641, of whom Walton speaks so highly, is scarcely to the taste of the present day. His huge folio is dull, pretentious, and didactic. Partly from Walton's encomium, however, partly from its rarity, it holds a distinguished place in most collections of angling books. The grim old Puritan, Richard Franck, 'Philanthropus,' as he calls himself, must on no account be neglected. He had been a Cromwellian trooper, and, when the king came to his own again, travelled northwards in disgust to catch salmon in Scotland. His title-page alone is stupendous, while his style is ornate, involved, and sententious, such as an intellectual madman might have written; and we believe Franck to have been a cross-grained religious lunatic. Still his book is valuable as being an early delineation of Scotland, and his anecdotes of fishing prove him to have been no mean performer with a rod and line. Hear him in the vein of 'Ercles:—

'I make no doubt on't, we have Copernicans amongst us, that can fancy the earth, as the orbs, turn round; so refined are the minds of some in this adulterous generation, to be winding and turning till He comes that will overturn and dissolve the elements like ice in warm water, so melt down the creation with one single blast, and strike that dead that violates his regal commands. The all-glorious beatifical star of heaven's high tribunal is already risen in our earthly horizon, which,

* In the 'Angler's Note Book' (Satchell), 1880, p. 117 seq.
VOL. CLVIII. NO. CCCXXIII. M

virtually lifting up itself by magnetick power, lifts up our souls also by a magnetism of Divine sympathy, whereby we shall ascend above these muddy cisterns of earth and clay, to blaze aloft in those illustrious and most illuminated mansions of beatitude and eternity.*

The knave does not hesitate to gird at Walton himself, but time has amply revenged the patriarch of the craft. Speaking of artificial flies for every month, such as Walton and many others have elaborately ordered, the profane swashbuckler lays on his blows apace:—

‘Isaac Walton (late author of the “Compleat Angler”) has imposed upon the world this monthly novelty, which he understood not himself; but stuffs his book with morals from Dubravius and others, not giving us one precedent of his own practical experiments, except otherwise where he prefers the trencher before the troling-rod; who lays the stress of his arguments upon other men’s observations wherewith he stuffs his indigested octavo; so brings himself under the angler’s censure and the common calamity of a plagiarist, to be pitied (poor man) for his loss of time in scribbling and transcribing other men’s notions. These are the drones that rob the hive, yet flatter the bees they bring them honey.’†

No other angler is known to us who has had the hardihood to pluck ‘the common father of all anglers’ by the beard, and outside the circle of fishermen no one, save Byron, has essayed the graceless feat. To how many thousands has not the ‘Compleat Angler’—that ‘indigested octavo,’ forsooth!—brought solace and wisdom, and what unborn thousands will yet rise up and call their sage blessed! As well should a man attempt to silence the nightingale or rob the honeysuckle of its sweetness, as depreciate the unaffected beauty of the ‘Compleat Angler.’

The eighteenth century was a ‘leaden century,’ even with regard to angling books. Indeed very few were published, whether it be compared with its predecessor or with our own age. The ‘Art of Angling’ by Best, and that by Bowlker, are useful treatises which have been frequently reprinted, and can hold their own against a crowd of modern competitors. The fishing poetry to which this century gave birth is its best characteristic. Of Rev. Moses Browne’s ‘Piscatory Eclogues’ we cannot say much; but the case is very different with the angling poetry of Gay and Thomson. Nor has Somerville, though more generally known by his poem on the Chase, altogether forgotten the more contemplative sister art. Gay was a North Devon man, and had probably fished in the streams

* Franck’s ‘Northern Memoirs’ (Sir W. Scott’s reprint, Edinburgh, 1821, p. 24).

† Ibid. p. 175.

of that piscatorial county. Thomson has written with more grace, but not with more exact reference to the incidents commonly met in fly-fishing. The Scotch burns beside which his youth was passed had been his nurses :—

Now, when the first foul torrent of the brooks,
Swelled with the vernal rains, is ebb'd away ;
And, whitening, down their mossy-tinctured stream
Descends the billowy foam ; now is the time,
While yet the dark-brown water aids the guile,
To tempt the trout. The well-dissembled fly,
The rod fine-tapering with elastic spring,
Snatched from the hoary steed the floating line,
And all thy slender watery stores, prepare.*

The translation of Oppian's 'Halieutics' by two Oxford scholars, Diaper and Jones,† is worth looking into, and is certainly a volume to be prized by the collector. The writers revel in the marvels told by Oppian, if their verse does not always transcend mediocrity. The reader shall judge it for himself :—

'First, be the fisher's limbs compact and sound,
With solid flesh and well-braced sinews bound,
Let wat'ry labours be his chief content,
The briny seas his nat'ral element,
Judicious art with long experience joined
Inform the ready dictates of his mind.
Let resolution all his passions sway,
Nor pleasures charm his mind, nor fears dismay.
From short repose let early vigour rise,
And all his soul awaken with his eyes ;
Well let his patience and his health sustain
Jove's piercing storms and Sirius' sultry reign.'

A sweeter and more attractive writer in every way is the Jesuit Father, Vanière.‡ In sixteen books, modelled on the 'Georgics' of Virgil, he sings the pastoral delights of agricultural and country life in general. His hexameters are wonderfully even in quality ; always interesting, and not unfrequently they rise into true poetry. Thus his pictures of the four seasons, of the vintage, and of the garden, are very pleasant, couched in a classical style, which at once betrays his models. A whole book (xv.) is devoted to *stagna*, and in describing these fish-preserves he is incidentally led to touch upon fishing,

* Thomson, 'Seasons,' Spring, 379. A still finer picture succeeds, the capture of 'the monarch of the brook.'

† Oxford, 1722.

‡ Jacobi Vanierii 'Prædium Rusticum' (Col. Munatianæ), 1750.

upon the fish themselves, the young fry, their perils, and their combats; the similarity, on which moralists have so often dwelt, between Pleasure taking man with her baits, and the wiles of the fisherman to capture his prey. His amusingly sententious manner seldom deserts the poet. When a pond has been drained and the eels remain behind in the mud, he cannot refrain from a moral:—

‘Exhaustis remanet stagnis anguilla, palustri
Mersa luto caput et sinuosa volumina torquens;
Repentem per stagna manu comprende tenaci,
Ne fluat, et vacuam, cum jam cepisse putabis.
Fortunæ similis, frustretur lubrica dextram.’ *

Among the pests of a stream, Vanière enumerates the otter, water-rat, and beaver, matted jungles of reeds and sedge, but above all too little food. And he forestalls the piscicultural maxim of the present day, to throw in any dead sheep or other animal. The moor-hen has a deservedly evil character among modern lovers of fish, and the heron is a worse foe than any other bird. The following description of the trout will be read with interest by fishermen. It is drawn from the life:—

‘Truta vagos amat obscuris in vallibus annes,
Et pigris injecta vadis, oblita decorem
Ipsa suum, partus et amorum nescia, vitam
Tristis agit, tardumque refert in carne saporem.
Tædia tanta levat, fessas errore viarum
Qui stagnis effiudit aquas; trutæque vaganti
Providet hospitium labentis ad ostia rivi,
Et mollem meminit ripam vestire perenni
Gramine, fulgenti sabulo conspergere fundum,
Saxorumque mora lympham irritare loquacem:
Talibus auxiliis vix truta carebit.’ †

The penultimate line here is a good example of the felicities of diction which occur in this poem.

Our own century has been fertile in books bearing on angling, but originality is scarce among them. Taken all in all, the book which it has produced of greatest celebrity is undoubtedly ‘*Salmonia*.’ He who does not know the mild wisdom of Halieus is ignorant of the philosophical pleasures of angling. With it we are inclined to place Kingsley’s admirable ‘*Chalk Stream Studies*.’ They are excellent instances of the subsidiary delights connected with fishing. Of manuals professing to be practical, ‘*Ephemera*,’ and Mr. F. Francis’s books, are incomparably the

* P. 289, ut sup.

† P. 282.

best; although the scholarly angler will find much that is characteristic in the treatises of Hofland, Jesse, Newland, Wilson (John and James), and Salter. The latter was an enthusiastic fisherman, and kept a well-known hatter's shop in London. Eminent in skill and patience at the waterside, as well as easy and spontaneous in style when he recounts the angling exploits of a long life, must be reckoned Mr. W. Henderson. Mr. St. John, Mr. Scrope, and Mr. Colquhoun have written with animation on the fishing of Scotland. The famous 'Newcastle Fishers' Garlands' form the best specimen of the century's angling poetry; and as an instance of excellent work in the bibliography of angling should be named the 'Chronicle of the Compleat Angler' by Mr. T. Westwood, who has caught much of Charles Lamb's archness, at whose feet he was brought up. But amongst the modern works devoted to the noble art the 'History of British Fishes,' by the Rev. William Houghton, which we have placed at the head of this article, deserves conspicuous notice. It appears in the shape of two noble quarto volumes, illustrated by coloured plates of all the varieties of fishes known in our rivers, and by vignettes, scarcely less attractive, of the spots most dear to the fraternity of the rod. Mr. Houghton has collected in these pages all that modern science has yet learned of the habits and varieties of the finny tribes, and he has combined these interesting details with copious allusions to classical literature. The chapters on the 'Salmonidæ' are of especial interest and beauty, for if salmon-fishing ranks deservedly as the highest branch of the angler's art, the growth and culture of the numerous peculiarities of salmon and trout are amongst the most curious phenomena of natural history. No book with which we are acquainted deserves a more honourable place in the Angler's Library. In comparison with such a work the rest of the literary rank and file of the century may well be disregarded. They are *biblia abiblia*; they swell the collector's shelves, but possess no merits, and only call the reader away from better books. Messrs. Satchell and Westwood's pages will guide the literary angler through their labyrinthine passages with unerring care and forethought.

No better example of the bibliographical value of the 'Bibliotheca Piscatoria' can be pointed out than the number of entries and pages devoted to Walton—*clarum et venerabile nomen*. Mr. Westwood, in his charming 'Chronicle of Izaak Walton,' describes fifty-three editions; in conjunction with Mr. Satchell he has now registered ninety. Particulars of their bibliography occupy some twenty pages. The world has

agreed to honour 'meek Walton,' and many a goodly edition can now be offered to his juvenile follower,

'When wearied with the tale thy times disclose,
The eye first finds thee out in thy secure repose.'*

It is quite possible that the interest which these varied editions will excite may yet unearth one or two more which have escaped even the lynx eyes of the compilers of the '*Bibliotheca Piscatoria*.' Forgotten copies of a rare book often come forward from dark cupboards and neglected shelves when attention is directed to them, like the toads which are supposed to have lived for two or three generations in the hole of a wall, till a sudden frost or the like splits up the stones around them.

Another test may be applied to the bibliography of the book. In the seventeenth century broke out a literary epidemic, which concerned itself with the spiritualising or allegorising of the fisherman's art. Our Lord Himself had given some colour to this method of interpretation. It was certainly not alien to primitive Christianity, as sculpture and art sufficiently prove. St. Augustine, too, speaks of Christians as being '*pisciculi*,' and draws out the teaching of baptism in connexion with the expression.† Still more curious is his remark, '*Piscis assus est Christus passus*.' But this passion for symbolism was dominant among the Caroline divines. Indeed it is scarcely possible to treat fishing in its more serious aspect without an eye to the Scriptural associations which it bears. This age, however, tended to draw them out to an exaggerated length, and not seldom incurred thereby the reproach of trifling or dealing ludicrously with the subject. Scattered up and down Messrs. Westwood and Satchell's book are references to Gardiner, Rawlinson, and other divines, on which a few minutes may be spent to exemplify this love of allegorising.

The rarest of those treatises which might be named in this connexion meets us on the threshold of the seventeenth century: '*A Book of Angling or Fishing. Whercin is shewed by Conference with Scriptures, the agreement betwene the Fishermen, Fishes, Fishing of both Natures, Temporall and Spirituall. By Saml. Gardiner, D.D. 1606.*' This book is only to be found in the splendid library of Mr. Huth, who acquired it from that of Mr. Cotton, Ordinary of Newgate, and in the Bodleian. Its connexion with fishing is

* Keble, 'First Sunday in Advent.'

† Compare, too, Tertullian, '*De Bapt.*' i.: '*Nos pisciculi secundum $\epsilon\chi\theta\upsilon\varsigma$ nostrum Jesum Christum in aqua nascimur.*'

purely figurative, and its chapters treat of 'the Nets and Angle Rod that are for this Fishing; the especial duties of the Spirituall Fisherman, of his Baytes and Fishes,' and the like. Passing chronologically onward to 1609 comes Dr. Rawlinson's 'Fishermen Fishers of Men; a sermon preached at Mercers' Chapell on Mid Lent Sunday.' This production is so quaint throughout that we will reproduce a few of its choicer sentences. 'Very likely,' says the worthy doctor, 'that while I thus launch forth into the deepe and east my nette upon the face of the waters, it will fare with me as with other fishermen who among many fish meet with some earps, and if by chance they alight upon a sturdy jack there is great tug betwixt them, whether they shall eatch the jack or the jack them.' Further on he asserts that spiritual fishers 'labour to cateh men, and with the draw net of God's word to draw them by the eares a sæculo, from the sea of this world ad sæcula sæculorum, to the shore of a better life; their nets being 'stretched out from Engaddi to Engallim, from the one end of the Mare Mortuum of this world to the other.' Once more:

'It is fabled by the poet (Ovid, Met. iii. 8) that Bacchus began his empire by the transmutation of Mariners into Fishes. So doth Christ, the true Bacchus, his genitus, (God of the substance of His Father begotten before the world, and Man of the substance of His Mother, borne in the world), begin His Kingdome, even the Kingdome of His Gospel, with the metamorphising of men into fishes, yet doth He not either transubstantiate them into fishes, like those mariners, or ingulfe them into the bellie of a fish, like Jonas, or make them fish the one halfe, flesh the other, like Myrmaides----

' "ut turpiter atrum
Desinat in piscem mulier formosa superne."

But hercin will He have them to symbolize with fishes, that as fishes are caught lineis textis, with a net of twisted lines, so must they be lineis ex Scriptura contextis, with the net of God's word made out of lines taken out of the Scripture.' .

A similar application of angling imagery to 'that great Tiberine fisherman,' the Pope, 'because that certaine great fishes had broken out of his netts torne and worne for age,' may be seen in Dr. Lionel Sharpe's envenomed book, a few years later.* Messrs. Westwood and Satchell refer to Jerom Phillips's 'Sermon at a Synode held at Southwell,' as another

* 'A Looking Glasse for the Pope; whercin he may see his owne face the expresse Image of Antichrist.' London, 1616. Epistle Dedicatorie, pp. 7, 8.

specimen of spiritualised angling, but have been misled by its title. Some ten or twelve lines in the dedication to the Bishop of Lincoln, and the text (Mark i. 17), comprise all that this painful preacher writes to the point. That his powers in allegorising, however, are not deficient, may be gathered from a single sentence (p. 8) which forms the keynote of the whole sermon. 'The former age indeed was a Leah, blear-eyed, yet fruitfull in many commendable workes; our age as Rachel, quicke sighted and beautifull to the eye, but barren: we are fruitfull indeed in professed religion, but fruitlesse of the true practise of pietie.*' The Honourable Robert Boyle's 'Reflections' are not unknown to our age, as they were reprinted in 1848. He is delightfully sententious at times on angling amid his verbose contemplations, and, as may be expected of a man who can write a whole discourse 'upon one's drinking water out of the brims of his hat,' is never at a loss for appropriate reflections on commonplace subjects. Thus another discourse is 'On a fish's struggling after having swallowed the hook;' another, 'On a fish's running away with the bait,' and the like.† The use which a seventeenth century moraliser would make of these incidents is sufficiently obvious. After Sir W. Waller's 'Divine Meditations' in 1680 this vein of thought runs thin and dies out, if we may here trust the 'Bibliotheca,' in 1779, in the arid waste of another sermon preached by one S. Stevens at the Old Meeting-place, Reading.

Once more, fishing naturally suggests fishponds, and few know in these days, when sea-fish is conveyed swiftly to all parts of the country, what a science our forefathers possessed of the mode of 'ordering' them. In the Middle Ages, while the monasteries and the old religion yet flourished, fishponds, whence a speedy supply of fish for fast days could be procured, were a necessity of life. Walton's favourite Dnbravius, the learned Bishop of Olmutz, discourses learnedly of these, and more can be gathered of them in the pages of Heresbachius, H.R. (i.e. Howlett), and Taverner.‡ In the eighteenth century, from religious uses, fresh-water fish had entered into the economical considerations of country gentlemen. A large literature now taught them how to manage carp, what stock of

* London, 1623.

† No. 19, 5, 10. See Boyle's Works, vol. iv. London, 1772, 4to (first published in 1665).

‡ Of the respective dates of 1552, 1570, 1596, and 1600. For an account of these treatises see Westwood and Satchell.

male and female fish respectively was to be kept, the size of the 'stews' in which these fish were seoured before appearing on the table, and the proper mode of draining their ponds and snatching a rich crop from their dry ooze. The future historian of English life and manners will find his labours lessened by the industry with which the *Bibliotheca* has been compiled. The treatises of Mordant, Marshall, North, Jacob, Mortimer, and others are here carefully registered, and will well repay the curious enquirer who ventures to disturb the dust which has settled upon their pages, and which appropriately reminds the scholar musing upon many things of the primal doom, as well of worn-out man as of trite and exhausted literary topics. With Rev. C. Marshall's '*Hints on Fishponds*' (3rd ed. 1800) the literature of the subject may be said to end. His remarks might be read by squires of the present day with profit. In spite of piscicultural and acclimatisation societies the waste of water which, if rightly managed, ought to furnish large supplies of food throughout the country, is deplorable. Marshall calculates that an acre of water ought to support 2,000 lbs. weight of fish. Although the farmer never possessed more well-meaning friends than at present, we will contribute our quota of advice and recommend him to think more of his ponds. After the peace of 1815, British enterprise at our fishing ports, railroads and increased wealth throughout the country speedily rang the knell of this industry. Ponds reverted to shallow sheets of water, and tangled masses of weeds, tenanted by a few bloated tench and eelp, never disturbed save by a stray schoolboy, and, despite port-wine sauce, tasting villainously of mud when his capture was placed upon the table.

It is time to bring our survey of angling literature to an end. Year by year in these piping times of peace, angling and the books written upon it make fresh disciples. The increase of the angling clubs in London alone during the last twenty years is enormous. Country clubs yearly spring up everywhere, and everywhere show robust vitality. New angling books, if worth reading, quickly go out of print; old ones can only be bought at prices which increase year by year, like the Sibyll's volumes. As we write, the International Fisheries Exhibition, the most complete and splendid of its kind, testifies to the universal interest felt in the subject. As for ourselves, simple, contented anglers, the flowery meads and the streams meandering through them, where the artificial fly can be thrown to trout, are more to our taste than crowded annexes and galleries filled with a bewildering supply of

curiosities and interesting objects. Like the country-loving Latin poet,

‘Rura mihi et rigui placeant in vallibus amnes;
Flumina amem silvasque inglorius.’

And when close seasons or foul weather detain the scholarly angler in his study, confinement, as we have striven to show, is never irksome. He has friends ranged upon his shelves among the great and good of the last four centuries, and each one teaches him thankfulness and peace.

ART. VI.—*Histoire de Charles VII.* Par G. DU FRESNE, MARQUIS DE BEAUCOURT. Deux tomes. Paris: 1881–2.

THESE volumes are marked by a tendency which of late years has been making itself more and more manifest throughout Europe, but especially in France, in one of the most important departments of Letters. History in the hands of Voltaire and Montesquieu, as with us in the hands of Hume and Gibbon, dealt with great subjects and large tracts of time, and, if somewhat wanting in research and learning, was conspicuous for its luminous thought, and for the breadth and force of its general judgments. The same characteristics, with the addition of more profound and exact knowledge, appear in the works of Macaulay and Arnold, though, unhappily, these are only fragments; and they are visible, though in different degrees, in the best writings of Guizot and Thierry, and even in the brilliant epic of Michelet. These great men, however, attained maturity before the middle of the present century, and can write no more; but in this generation a revolution in this sphere of knowledge has been going on, and is all but complete. History is now a matter of infinite research into the original sources of information on the past which in our day are being generally disclosed; and an historian is deemed unworthy of the name who does not explore these mines of accumulated and undigested fact, and gather the materials of his work from them. As a necessary result, historical writers avoid large themes and wide spaces of time, and limit themselves to special subjects; their labours exhibit, as a general rule, rather erudition and fulness of detail than felicitous arrangement and the philosophic spirit; and reflection, art, and generalising power are stifled as it were under a load of minute incident. They become annalists rather than historians. In

France, the land of extremes, the peculiarities of this method have recently become most marked and decisive, and with the least happy consequences. The French intellect, during the last fifteen years, and especially since the war of 1870, has been busily engaged in the contemplation of the past, and has penetrated the recesses of bygone ages with assiduous care and intelligent skill. The fruits, however, of this persevering toil have been, on the whole, alike in kind: we have had careful narratives of reigns and epochs, of institutions, campaigns, and sieges; especially we have had remarkable studies of various passages of the great Revolution; but not one of these works embraces a grand subject in all its parts, and, if admirable for their abundant knowledge, they are generally deficient in breadth of view and in comprehensive and discerning thought. In fact, if we make the single exception of M. Taine's able and brilliant book on the Revolution, disfigured as it is by many faults, France has produced nothing, during the last decade, that can be called a great historical work, and for the present, at least, she is barren of the genius to which we owe masterpieces like the '*Esprit des Lois*' and the '*Ancien Régime*'—two of the noblest specimens of enquiry and thought in the domain of philosophical history.

Our remarks on this style of composing history are illustrated in the present volumes. They are the first instalment of what will be an elaborate work of extreme length, on the reign of Charles VII. of France; and they abundantly show the merits and defects to which we have just alluded. The research of the author deserves high praise; and we readily believe that, as he tells us, it has occupied twenty-five years of life. M. de Beaucourt has sought out all that the Past can disclose with regard to the theme he has chosen; and, with this object, he has not only mastered every chronicle and book that touches his subject, but has diligently examined the immense mass of original contemporaneous evidence that can, even remotely, relate to it. For this purpose he has ransacked the archives of France, England, the Low Countries, and Rome; he has consulted public documents of all kinds, and the papers of many noble families; and he has thoroughly exhausted every source of knowledge, from the correspondence of warriors, statesmen, and kings to the daily accounts of royal households. In short, nothing has escaped his notice that bears on the France of Charles VII.; and the amount of material collected by him, however bulky, is of real value. But to comprehend the times of Charles VII., and their significance in the march of history, it is necessary to look before

and behind them ; and a reader should have a clear conception of the state and position of Europe and France during the reigns at least of the House of Valois, if he would really understand the period. M. de Beaucourt, however, as far as he has gone, has confined himself strictly to the years from 1404 to 1435 ; he has told us much about the first part of the troubled annals of Charles VII., but nothing of what went before it ; and to judge from his method, he will close his work with equal disregard of whatever followed. His book is thus without breadth of view and information on large spaces of time ; it is limited in conception, though vast in size ; and it is a special study of the annals of a reign rather than a complete history. These volumes, moreover, have other faults which call for an adverse verdict on them. Conscientious and minute almost to a fault, M. de Beaucourt has no sense of the picturesque, which some of his countrymen, like Michelet, for example, have carried to excess. He describes in the tamest fashion such scenes as the great day of Agincourt, the memorable battles of Verneuil and Baugé, the coronation of Henry V., and the splendid episode of the Maid of Orleans : events, assuredly, which a greater writer would have made, so to speak, to stand out from the canvas. Even the arrangement of the book is defective : the narrative wants organic unity ; a *résumé* of general events is followed by a succession of chapters, which treat the subject in a fragmentary way, but never deal with it as a whole ; and the result is to perplex the reader, and to leave on the mind a weaker impression than so laborious a work deserves. In a word, these volumes are more like a chronicle than what a history ought to be—that is, a vivid picture of national life.

The reign of the king which this work will embrace is one of the most important in the history of France. The youth and early manhood of Charles VII. fell on times which illustrate the remark of Burke, that it has been the ‘ fate of the French Monarchy to have ebbs and flows beyond all other States.’ Insanity and crime, so to speak, held sway in the Palace in the first years of his infancy ; and under the rule of his unhappy father, and of his shameless and adulterous mother, the work of reconquest and reconstruction which had been achieved by Charles the Wise was utterly and, as it seemed, for all time undone. From the Somme to the Garonne, the realm was convulsed by a civil war, so protracted and fierce that large and flourishing tracts were reduced to a desert ; and the capital was more than once the scene of anarchy, such as that of the League and of 1793. The weakness of the distracted State then opened a way to the foreign invader ; a

defeat as crushing as Sedan or Waterloo destroyed the military strength of the monarchy; and when Henry V., with the assent of Europe, and amidst the applause of its light populace, marched into Paris in the pride of triumph, France seemed on the point of complete subjection. Nor did the conquest appear transient, like the chivalric raids of Edward III.; the rule of Henry was upheld or recognised by the great vassals of the French Crown, and was sustained by ably designed alliances; and the vanquished nation was so prostrate that it maintained only a show of resistance.

Yet even at this crisis the tendency of France to rise superior to adverse fortune, to recover strength, and to regain unity, made itself manifest in a few years, and the vigorous elements of her national life stirred and quickened amidst disaster and ruin. Charles VII., though a boy, was proclaimed king; and from the centre of his weak power at Bourges a resistance gradually increasing in force was made to foreign and domestic foes, and a contest began which ere long showed that his claim to the throne was no vain pretence. Charles was, we believe, a very feeble ruler, whatever patriotic Frenchmen may say; his government was a mere shadow for years, and in many respects was as bad as possible; his military success was never great, and was overbalanced by many disasters; and, apart from one remarkable figure, there was but little genius in his camp or his councils. Yet, notwithstanding repeated defeats, his arms, even in the field, made progress; his authority, growing in an increasing circle, extended its limits slowly but surely; and, within a generation from the calamitous time at which it had seemed all but extinct, it was well-nigh complete throughout his kingdom. His chief enemy, England, lost her conquests, and abandoned the strife of more than a century; his great feudatories gathered round the Crown; the formidable alliances combined against him were weakened or altogether dissolved; and, above all, France, torn no longer by war, and rescued from civil strife and anarchy, was placed under a settled government, and could call herself again a united people. A few years passed; and though he never attained the ordinary length of human life, the king lived to see the once fallen State the most really formidable power of Europe, and gradually assuming the territorial limits, the institutions, and the type of government which characterised the great Bourbon monarchy. Lorraine had fallen under the influence of France before the death of Charles VII.; the great stronghold of Metz had felt his arms; and he had asserted that claim to the frontier of the Rhine which

Richelieu vindicated in the seventeenth century, and which nothing will efface from the minds of Frenchmen. Before long, in the reign of his son, the great Power which had menaced France from the East was broken up and deprived of its strength. French Burgundy was annexed to the Crown; Anjou, Provence, and Brittany followed; and the sixteenth century beheld the monarchy established from the Moselle to the Pyrences, and, notwithstanding the anarchy of the League, and the decrepitude of the House of Valois, and the brief hour of the supremacy of Spain, full of force and capable of expansion. We must ascribe, moreover, to the reign of Charles VII. many of the changes in the administration of the State which made France what she was in the age of Louis XIV., and even down to the great Revolution. Then, in the collapse of the feudal arrays were formed the germs of that great standing army which was destined to make the Crown absolute, and for years to be the terror of Europe. Then, in the distress and havoc produced by war, and in the growing power of the central Government, began that decline of the local liberties and franchises of mediæval France which terminated in the complete suppression of the States-General for five generations, and of every check on the all-absorbing monarchy, and which ultimately led to a world-wide catastrophe. Then, too, the relations between the Church and the State which existed in France for the next three centuries were established upon a lasting basis; and then, most important perhaps of all, we see the beginnings of that encroaching system of government and administration which made the Royal Council and its subordinates supreme in all departments of the State, and which deprived the *noblesse* of real authority.

The events of this reign were so remarkable that national tradition has affixed the epithet of 'victorious' to the name of the king. This, however, is but a patriotic legend; and, as has often happened, it concentrates the lustre of a memorable age on a single figure which personifies, so to speak, its tendencies. M. de Beaucourt, with his wonted research, has put together and prefixed to his book the views of French historians from the earliest times, on the conduct and character of Charles VII.; but he avoids drawing a conclusion from them. These testimonies show that the writers usually reflect the current opinions and prejudices of their respective periods. Speaking generally, when the monarchical spirit prevails they describe the king as a master mind, controlling and ordering the course of events; but when influences of a different kind predominate, they either dwell on his worst defects or present him as

a mere royal cipher, or confine themselves to the leading tendencies and broad features of the history of the day. The ideas of the age of Louis XIV. thus appear in a work of the seventeenth century which declared that ‘the valour of Charles VII. expelled the English enemy from Guienne and Normandy; that his admirable forethought preserved the liberties of his kingdom through the Pragmatic Sanction; that his administration of the army gives proof of extraordinary vigilance and skill; and that no monarch of Europe possessed an artillery force of equal excellence.’ So too, an historian of 1805, who informs us that Charles VII. ‘deserves the title of the Restorer of France; that he found her invaded and freed her soil; and that his wise government stayed the plague of war, introduced order into the courts of justice, guaranteed the liberties of the Gallican Church, and settled taxation on a sound basis,’ is evidently thinking of Napoleon I.; and, similarly, a writer of 1865 alludes doubtless to Napoleon III., when he describes Charles ‘as one of those rulers who completely mastered the insubordination and license of the first days of his reign, and who, having found France discouraged and fallen, gave her fresh confidence and renewed energies.’ On the other hand, the remarkable sketch of the king by the brilliant President Hénault—‘Charles VII., so to speak, was but a witness of the extraordinary events of his reign; Fortune, in one of her freaks, gave him powerful enemies and subjects able to defend his throne, but he really had no part in all this’—refers very probably to Louis XV., and breathes the spirit that sapped the Bourbon monarchy. And as for the writers of Democratic France, one of the ablest has thus embodied their views:—‘Charles VII., a weak and indolent king, fills a large space in our history, less from what he accomplished himself than from what was accomplished in his name. It was his merit that he accepted the influence and followed the directions of the ablest and most intelligent men of his time. . . . The spirit of reform and progress in this reign modelled the whole administration of the kingdom on a new type; the finances, the army, the courts of justice, and the police of the State were transformed. . . . The form of modern monarchy, of a government destined hereafter to possess unity and freedom, had been discovered; its fundamental institutions were in existence; all that remained to be done was to maintain and extend it, and to root it in the hearts of the nation. The reign of Charles VII. was an era of national energy. All that was great and original in it, however, proceeded, not

‘from the personal conduct of the sovereign, but from a kind of general inspiration which revealed itself everywhere in progress, in new ideas, and in a sagacious policy.’

One of his main objects, M. de Beaucourt tells us, is to unravel the truth from these conflicting judgments, and to evolve the character of Charles VII. from trustworthy contemporaneous evidence:—

‘The only way to decide a question debated by historians during three centuries, and to determine, accurately and conclusively, the place of Charles VII. in history, is to endeavour, before all things, to draw him out, so to speak, from the obscurity in which he has been hidden; and to present him on the scene of events, not in an uncertain light, and in borrowed colours, according to the fancy of the artist, but with full and circumstantial details, with evidence drawn from authentic documents, and with that fulness of information which will enable the reader to judge for himself, and to decide with all the accessible facts before him. Our continual object has been to examine the sources of our knowledge in this matter, to penetrate the subject more thoroughly than has been attempted hitherto; and for this purpose to exhaust not only the writings of previous authors, but all new information which our own investigation has been able to collect. This was the only way to compose a history which, in truth, had not previously been written, and to make the character of the king appear in its real aspect.’

In this, as in every part of his work, M. de Beaucourt's industry is very great, and he has accumulated a large store of material with reference to this branch of his subject. Yet, though he endeavours to claim a verdict on the whole favourable for Charles VII., we cannot say that he has in the least changed the view we hold of the character of the king. As a ruler, Charles, we believe, was one of the weakest and least capable of men; and the most striking feature of his reign, perhaps, was that the monarchy made immense progress in the elements of enduring greatness and strength, and that scarce anything of this was due to the monarch. We shall not dwell—though we cannot forget what the youth was of many an able prince—on the feebleness of Charles in his earlier years, when he was carried about as a mere badge of royalty, and when he could not make his authority felt. But in manhood and down to the end of his life he seems never to have had the faculty of mastering events and ruling men, and more than once he showed himself unequal to rise to the level of great emergencies, and to cope boldly with adverse fortune. Throughout his reign he was controlled by ministers who drew him hither and thither at will; and although he was personally brave, he shrank from encountering risk on many occasions when all seemed to depend on his moral courage.

We even doubt if he possessed the quality of discerning merit, and of making a choice of good instruments of power. The highest praise that can be bestowed on him is, that he seconded to some extent the policy of his ablest predecessors, in consolidating and enlarging the monarchy, and that he allowed free scope to the march of events which were making that consummation certain. No proof exists that he had any share in the great reforms in the administration of the State which made his reign so important an era; and, so far as he took part in the government, his conduct seems to have been chiefly notable for prodigality and abuses of power. As for his private character, tradition records that he was affable, clement, and of a kindly nature; but these good qualities were marred by a fault not uncommonly seen in weak persons—a tendency to distrust and suspicion; and he had a large share of the vices and foibles which are the besetting sins of princes. M. de Beaucourt thinks that he has accomplished much by showing that Charles was probably guiltless of unbridled licentiousness in his first youth; that he was too harassed by trouble and care to have been a mere votary of idle pleasure, and that he was a religious man, in the sense that he was not unmindful of the offices of the Church. Yet we cannot forget that this reign is supposed to have had a *Parc aux Cerfs* of its own; the luxury, the waste, and the frivolity of the king are attested by a large body of evidence; as for his piety, he was perhaps superstitious, but it certainly was not seen in his conduct: and, for the rest, history is not concerned to dwell on qualities of this kind at length, unless they affect the general course of events.

The character, however, of Charles VII. is of little importance compared with his reign. The infant who was to rule France in one of the most chequered phases of her history, was the fifth son of Charles VI. by his consort, Isabel of Bavaria, and was born in 1403. M. de Beaucourt describes at great length in what courtly splendour the child was brought up, and how his earliest years were nursed in the pomp and magnificence of the fifteenth century. Yet his boyhood was passed in the midst of troubles, and before he had attained youth, his House and his country had been overwhelmed by a dark tide of misfortune. His father, before his birth, was struck down by a malady which had shattered his reason; the fame of his mother was stained by incest and adultery of the worst kind; and hands such as theirs proved unable to guide a kingdom already rent in twain by the unnatural strife of the princes of the blood. After the assassination

of the Duke of Orleans by the Duke of Burgundy, John the Fearless, France was plunged in civil war which lasted, with intermissions, for more than twenty years; and in that barbarous and internecine contest, in which the old quarrel of the North and South was again waged after the lapse of a century, under the hostile standards of Burgundy and Armagnac, the whole land was convulsed and deluged with blood. The capital, with that strange impulse of which it has given proof on many occasions, set up in the hour of national peril a wild and passionate claim to independence, and the monarchy, decried and without authority, went as it were to pieces and gave place to anarchy. The boy shared the fortunes of the royal family, tossed to and fro between the contending factions; he, doubtless, heard many a cruel tale of massacre, rapine, and deeds of revenge, and he beheld the wild scenes of the rising of Caboché when the mobs of Paris broke into the palace, expelled the king and queen from its precincts, and, anticipating the Jacobinism of a later age, established a government of the streets in blood. Ere long disaster and civil strife were to be succeeded by war from abroad. A great soldier and no mean statesman, Henry V. of England, saw in the divisions of France an opportunity of again asserting the Plantagenet claim to the French crown, and he made preparations to invade the kingdom while he negotiated with the chiefs of the rival parties, who were willing enough to invoke his aid. M. de Beaucourt insists that the Duke of Burgundy was alone guilty of this unpatriotic treason; but the fact is, that the first overtures went to Henry from the Armagnac camp; and we see no distinction, in this matter, between the two factions, until long afterwards. At last, Henry suddenly dropped the mask, and having proclaimed war set sail from Portsmouth. We need not dwell on the events that followed; how, after the successful siege of Harfleur, the English soldiery, a handful of men, and suffering from disease and privations, were brought to bay by a great army led by the flower of the nobles of France; and how, in a contest which had seemed hopeless, victory remained at last with the English bowmen. The day of Agincourt, with its immense slaughter, laid the power of France for a time in the dust; and had Henry been able to complete his success, he certainly might have entered the capital.

This terrible defeat made but little change in the attitude of the savage factions which were tearing France and each other to pieces. An event, however, occurred soon afterwards which promised to alter the position of affairs. The two elder sons of Charles VI.—the other three had passed away before—died

suddenly within a few months of each other, and Charles became Dauphin at the age of fourteen. As the deceased princes had been completely under the influence of the Duke of Burgundy—M. de Beaucourt omits to state that their deaths were attributed to Armagnac poison—it seemed not improbable that the new Dauphin would represent the authority of the Crown with the semblance of independence at least; and, in fact, a commission in his father's name invested him with a large share in the government. John the Fearless, however, was not to be balked; he got possession of the persons of the king and queen, and having entered Paris at the head of his troops drove out Charles and all who adhered to him, having previously slaughtered in the streets and prisons many thousands of his Armagnac enemies, a feat of arms which the excited capital, threatened alike with famine and foreign war, characteristically hailed as a great deliverance, as centuries afterwards it welcomed the Allies, and, after Sedan, shouted for Gambetta and Trochu. Before long Henry had again invaded the territory of his defeated enemy, and, Rouen having fallen, and Normandy having been overrun, France again witnessed the ignoble spectacle of her factions bidding against each other in the interest of a relentless conqueror. Whatever M. de Beaucourt may say, the Dauphin, now nominally chief of the Armagnacs, was just as ready as John the Fearless to make large concessions to the national foe; and Henry equally maintained towards both an attitude of cool and grasping selfishness. The conditions of the English king, however, after his late victories, were of such a kind that neither competitor could assent to them, and in their disappointment and baffled hopes they were led gradually to approach each other. After long conferences between the leaders on each side, it was arranged that Charles and the Duke of Burgundy should meet and discuss the terms of a truce, and a general reconciliation seemed not improbable. The fair prospect was, however, marred by the treacherous murder of John the Fearless, slain by followers of Charles on the bridge of Montereau, in revenge perhaps for the Duke of Orleans. We quote M. de Beaucourt's account of a tragedy which once more opened an era of blood and disaster for France:—

‘The bridge was wholly palisaded. At each end it was closed by a barrier; on the bridge itself, but nearer the town, a closed space had been reserved, and this was entered by a kind of wicket. Having passed the barrier, the duke, as he walked forward, met the friends of the Dauphin. “Come and present yourself to his Highness,” they

said; "he awaits you." "I am going," was the answer. The duke then passed the wicket, followed by ten knights whom he had named, and by his secretary, Seguinat, and leaving his escort outside. In fact, it had been arranged that the people of either prince should hold the barriers at the ends of the bridge. As soon as the duke had passed the wicket was closed. . . . He then advanced towards the Dauphin, who was at the bottom of the enclosed space, with his back against the palisades, in armour, and with his sword girt on. John the Fearless, taking off his velvet surcoat, bowed low, and knelt with one knee on the ground. . . . The Dauphin insisted upon the evils which the soldiers of either party were doing, and upon the progress of the enemy; he urged the duke to decide on what was to be done. . . . He dwelt also upon the wrongs which the duke had done. "Sir," replied the duke, "I have only done what I ought." Augry words were then exchanged. De Neuville then approached his master, whose face was aglow with anger. . . . The duke, too, had laid his hand on his sword. "Do you dare lay hands on your sword in the presence of the Dauphin?" exclaimed Robert de Laire. . . . Swords were drawn, and shouts were raised. The Dauphin was hurried out of the enclosure. On this, armed men burst through the wicket crying out, "Kill, kill!" John the Fearless fell dead under the blows of the Dauphin's followers. Neuville, with De Vergy, who had tried to defend their master, was mortally wounded.'

'Through the hole in the skull of John the Fearless'—it is the striking phrase of an old chronicler—"the English enemy 'made his way into France.' The deed of blood rekindled the fury of the factions which, for a time, had subsided, and largely increased the power of the foreign invader. The young successor of the murdered duke held the Dauphin up to the execration of Europe as accessory to foul treachery and crime, made preparations to renew the strife, and placed the whole resources of the great power of Burgundy at the disposal of the victorious King of England. On their side the Armagnacs flew to arms everywhere; and, having at their head the heir of the crown, appealed to the patriotic pride of France, giving a kind of grandeur to a party feud; and from this time, doubtless, the hostile camps represented the cause of the foreign enemy, and of a resistance in a certain sense national. The miserable state of the unhappy land which seemed destined to be the prize of the contest is thus described by M. de Beaucourt:—

'Abandoned during many years to the implacable strife of factions, to English invasion, and to the movements and ravages of all kinds of troops, France seemed exhausted and destroyed. "The tempest of civil war blew everywhere; war, in its most cruel aspect, was waged between children of the same house, and even of the same blood; and the innumerable quarrels of the nobles mingled in the general

“conflict.” In the towns, heavy taxes, for the most part employed in providing for the work of defence, ruined the inhabitants; a frightful rise of prices, repeated famines, and frequent epidemics, added to the universal suffering of the nation. In Paris, a hundred thousand souls perished in a few months; they had come to this, that the corpses were flung pell-mell into huge ditches, “laid out, and then covered over with “a little clay.” The inhabitants were compelled to abandon their dwellings, burdened with ruinous charges, and disappeared, “as if “they had become desperate.” Wolves every night made their way into the towns, and wrought terrible havoc. In the country, the fields were deserted, uncultivated, and lay covered with brambles and furze. From the Loire to the Somme, cultivation was for many years interrupted; you would have said you were in an enemy’s country. Every-where the roads had been broken up. There was no security, nor commerce, even no religious observances, for the churches had been burned or wrecked.’

It seemed impossible even to compare the resources and strength of the hostile powers in the contest that was about to open. Henry certainly was the first soldier of Europe; he was at the head of an invincible army; and he was backed by the whole might of England, united to a man to carry on the war. At this period, too, his ally, Burgundy, was perhaps the most powerful prince on the Continent; he ruled or influenced an immense territory from the Zuyder Zee to the verge of Lorraine, and from the Rhine to the Upper Loire; and the domains of his vassal or friendly nobles extended almost to the gates of Paris. The north of France was thus at the mercy of enemies irresistible in the field; and as there was a strong English party in Aquitaine, whilst Brittany, under her own dukes, maintained a more than dubious allegiance, the monarchy was equally ill-defended on the west. Nor had Henry failed to secure the aid or the acquiescence of foreign States; he had won over the Emperor Sigismund, who at first had been unfriendly to him; he had compelled or induced the Spanish kingdoms to be neutral or to reject French overtures; and he had some reason to hope that he might prevent Scotland from giving assistance to her old ally, for the heir to the Scottish throne was his captive. He had succeeded, too, by a stroke of policy in strengthening immensely his own position, and in weakening and dividing his foes. By the Treaty of Troyes—a bargain enforced by the conqueror at the point of his sword—Charles VI. and his queen had proclaimed the Dauphin a criminal unworthy to wear a crown, had declared the Plantagenet king their heir, and had given him the hand of their daughter in marriage; and this compact, unnatural as it was, by affording a legal sanction to Henry’s claims, and

offering a fair excuse for desertion, detached several of the great vassals of France from what seemed the desperate cause of Charles. The triumph of the allies seemed, therefore, certain, and little appeared in the opposite scale to redress the balance of adverse fortune and to avert the conquest and ruin of France.

Charles, doubtless, was not without resources; and his cause had elements of latent power beyond the ken of the men of his time. Though he had no force that could cope in the field with the trained and formidable English soldiery, he was never without a numerous army; and foreign mercenaries flocked to his ranks, with large bodies of irregular troops, of real value in feudal warfare. Nor was he without allies abroad. Scotland, in spite of Henry, threw in her lot with France, and gave her effectual aid; some of the German and Italian princes, jealous of the encroaching power of Burgundy, showed moral sympathy at least with Charles, and Martin V. upheld his claims with the authority of the Roman Pontiff. What, however, chiefly gave him support was a circumstance of which the real import was not appreciated in that day: the national forces were on his side, though undeveloped and, as yet, crossed and interfered with by opposing influences. The South and the central provinces of France never faltered in their allegiance to him; and in the North, in the West, and even in Burgundy—whatever their great overlords might do—his cause was sustained by many nobles and had the sympathy of the mass of the people. In short, though not a nation as yet, France dimly felt that her future destinies depended upon the success of Charles; and it was significant of the general feeling that, even after the Treaty of Troyes, a government was formed in the name of the Dauphin, was administered by many of the officials of the State, and was largely obeyed by the different bodies which represented in mediæval France the authority of the Crown and the people alike. These sources of power were, however, unseen, or at least wholly underrated at the time; and Europe seems to have thought the conquest and dismemberment of France a certain event.

M. de Beaucourt describes the incidents of the war, from its beginning to the Treaty of Arras, which, by separating England and Burgundy, assured the ultimate success of Charles. The narrative, as usual, is full of matter; but it is related without effect and proportion, and it scarcely contains a trace of reflection. The allies, holding a third of France, and occupying the not unwilling capital, where Henry, after his triumphant entry, had held high state

for nearly two years, for the most part were victorious in the field; and the cause of France seemed more than ever hopeless, when, after the complete defeat of Verneuil, Salisbury reached the Loire and laid siege to Orleans. Had that city fallen, the royal forces must have been driven behind the hills of Auvergne; and though, owing to one of the strangest episodes that have occurred in the annals of war, that event, though imminent, did not take place, still, even after the achievements of the Maid, the French arms encountered many reverses. Yet, though France was overrun to the centre, and English fleets more than once made destructive descents on her western coasts, the country and people were not subdued; several towns and fortresses held out in the North, even in the midst of the conquered provinces; and long before the Treaty of Arras the prospects of the allies had become unpromising. On the other hand, his imperfect success at Baugé would have made Charles master of Paris had he known how to employ the occasion; the discomfiture of his foes at Orleans enabled him at once to advance to Rheims; and the 'King of Bourges,' as he was contemptuously called, defeated and baffled as he constantly was, remained more formidable in 1435 than he had been when the contest began. M. de Beaucourt has overlooked the causes of these notable events; but they may be collected from his narrative, and we shall endeavour to point them out, for they give enduring interest to this passage of history.

Two circumstances at the outset of the war were highly auspicious to the cause of Charles. The death of Henry V. removed from the scene the ablest and deadliest of his enemies; and the death of Charles VI., his ill-fated father, placed him on the throne and invested him with increased authority. These events, however, though of great importance, were but accidents in the march of history; and more essential facts determined the issue. In the character of the warfare of the time we must seek one of the reasons, at least, why France was not at once subdued, and was able to make a prolonged resistance. That great nation has been invaded three times in the course of this century; and on each occasion it succumbed to its foes after a struggle of only a few weeks or months. Despite his astonishing feats in Champagne, the fall of Paris in 1814 deprived Napoleon I. of his Empire; and Waterloo, in the following year, placed France completely at the Allies' mercy. The result was the same in 1870-1; and though, after the disasters of Metz and Sedan, Paris kept the Germans for a time at bay, the nation was never perhaps

more prostrate than when it submitted to the Treaty of Frankfort. It was very different during the long contest waged between the Plantagenets and the House of Valois in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. France in that strife met three great defeats not surpassed in her military annals; and more than once she seemed on the point of extinction as an independent State. Yet the disaster of Crécy did little more than secure Calais to Edward III.; that of Poitiers had no decisive results; that of Agincourt merely gave Henry V. a base of operations to invade Normandy; and notwithstanding these immense reverses, France continued to fight, and at last triumphed. This striking difference is largely due to the change which has passed over the conditions of war between our own time and the Middle Ages. Armies are now so organised that they can keep the field without the intermission of the seasons; they can be moved great distances with extreme celerity; they are furnished with terrible means of destruction, the formidable inventions of modern science; they are trained to march, to manœuvre, to fight, with an efficacy which in the days of Froissart would have seemed beyond the capacity of man; and they are composed of multitudes which a Du Guesclin or a Talbot would have pronounced impossible. On the other hand, civilisation has made the natural defences of a country weaker; the multiplication of roads and bridges has facilitated the advance of an enemy; the diminution of the power and numbers of fortresses has had a like result; and the improvement of agriculture, by increasing the means of subsistence for an invading army, has operated in the same direction. War in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was carried on in a very different fashion, and in character and effects was wholly dissimilar. Armies were still, in the main, the feudal militia; they were on foot only a few weeks in summer; their movements were pitiably slow and limited; their artillery and arms were cumbrous and feeble; their operations were rude, imperfect, and seldom produced decisive effects; and compared with the hosts of the present day, they were no more than a handful of men. Again, a country in those days presented great and various obstacles to an invader; the roads were few and bad, and the large rivers were bridged only at wide intervals; every avenue was guarded by feudal castles, and every town was a kind of fortress; woods and marshes barred an invader's progress; and owing to the backward state of husbandry, a hostile army was often unable to obtain supplies in its line of march, and was paralysed or compelled to retreat. Offensive operations are thus favoured to an extraordinary

degree in modern war; the obstinate and protracted wars of defence which were waged, occasionally with complete success, even down to the eighteenth century, have become altogether things of the past; and this great distinction in some measure accounts for the failure of England and the success of Charles in the conflict under our present notice. We may add that war in the feudal age was perhaps even slower and less decisive than in times reckoned completely barbarous. The hosts of Attila overran Gaul unresisted, until they perished at Châlons; and Charles Martel was unable to check the wave of Saracen conquest until it had touched the Loire.

Again, the war between the allies and Charles was that of a coalition with a single Power, and of a coalition which contained elements of division, weakness, and mutual distrust. England, doubtless, even after Henry's death, threw her whole energies into the strife; Parliament freely lavished her blood and treasure to maintain and extend her French conquests; and English nobles in Paris hailed the boy Henry VI. as the King of France. It was otherwise, however, with the Power which formed her principal support in the long conflict. Philip of Burgundy, indeed, regarded Charles as stained with the blood of his murdered father; and for a considerable time he gave weighty aid to the invaders in their attempted conquest. The personal animosities of rulers, however, seldom overcome their traditional sympathies and what, in the long run, are their interests; and the ties which united England and Burgundy began gradually to diminish in strength. The duke could not but feel that, if he was a sovereign, he was also one of the great peers of France, and near in blood to the House of Valois; he could not despise the French tendencies of his nobles and of the mass of his subjects; and what could he gain by keeping the crown of the Capets on a Plantagenet head, and making England the chief State of Europe? The force of these sentiments was increased by his double quarrel with Gloucester and Bedford, by the contempt more than once expressed for his conduct and policy by the English commanders, and by the unceasing efforts of France in the field; and thus by degrees he became lukewarm in what he probably thought was an ill-omened cause; and for years before the Treaty of Arras he sent scarcely a man to the English camp, and he had set negotiations on foot with Charles. As for the Duke of Brittany, he inclined before long to the side of France; and though his attitude was never loyal, he refused to give the invaders assistance; and his brother Richmond for a time led the forces of Charles as Constable of France,

recruited them with numerous Breton levies, and was practically head of the Dauphin's government. So, too, nearly all the great feudal lords who had ranged themselves under the allied standards returned ultimately to their true allegiance; and thus a coalition irresistible in the field, and which seemed master of the destinies of France, was really less powerful than it appeared to be, and had become a mere name before it was finally dissolved.

The associations besides, which surrounded Charles, in combination with the spirit of the age, were influences that largely told in his favour. That he had a legitimate title to the crown of France was as little perhaps to Henry V. as were the claims of Louis XVIII. to Metternich, or those of the Count of Chambord to Bismarck; and the Lancastrian generals had no scruples in assailing him as a usurping pretender. For Burgundy, however, and the feudatories of France he possessed the hereditary right to the throne and the majesty that attached to it: he was a sun in the stars of a noble firmament, a centre from which the links depended that bound together a great dominant caste; and though feudalism was fast passing away, this circumstance powerfully aided his cause. Charles, too, not only enjoyed the support of the divinity which hedged round a king, he was a near kinsman to every ruler engaged against him in this long contest: he was a brother-in-law of Henry, and of Philip of Burgundy; he was connected in blood with the Duke of Brittany, and with nearly all his great rebel vassals; and though too much is not to be made of this, it diminished the animosity of the league against him. As the allied sovereigns felt the ties of kindred which, in the peril of France in 1712-14, bound many of them to Louis XIV., so this influence worked in some measure for Charles; just as we see an opposite tendency in the treatment received by Napoleon III., and by other rulers not of royal blood, when overtaken by defeat and ill fortune. It should be added, too, as was to be expected, that the alliances of Charles grew more cordial and numerous as his prospects improved. Notwithstanding the marriage of James I. with an Englishwoman of the House of Lancaster, the efforts of Scotland in the interest of France became greater as the war continued; and, considering what Scotland was in those days, these efforts must be pronounced wonderful. Castile, too, which had hesitated at first, inclined finally to the side of Charles; and more than once a Castilian fleet protected his coasts from English cruisers. The Dukes of Austria, Savoy, and Milan, for different reasons, also became more or less active in the cause of France. The

marriage of a son of the House of Anjou, from which Charles had taken his own consort, extended his influence over Lorraine, and gave him a strong position on the flank of Burgundy, and the emperor was at last induced to give his pretensions his august sanction. The support, too, afforded by Martin V. was continued by his successor Eugenius; and in the brief revival of the power of the Church which followed the close of the Great Schism this was in itself a gain of importance.

These circumstances, however, favourable as they were, could not have saved Charles but for the devotion of France. The nation, we have said, from the outset of the war felt in a certain sense that its cause was his, and the sentiment deepened as the contest progressed. The efforts made by the loyal provinces of the centre and South were great and unceasing, and it is touching to read how, after Verneuil, 'the lords of Dauphiné and Auvergne made their way with their vassals to the camp of the Dauphin;' and how town after town supplied arms and men, 'to maintain the right against the English enemy.' The nobles, thinned by the carnage of Agincourt, or largely ranged under the pennon of Burgundy, were not very numerous in the army of Charles, but their place was supplied by leading men of the lower *seigneurie* and of the middle classes, and the people showed its patriotism by sending recruits in thousands to join the royal standards. In fact, though as yet it had not taken shape, the future standing army of France had its origin in the levies thus collected from the lower classes, and in the mercenaries attached to them, and from this date we can trace the beginnings and even the renown of the French artillery. The national feeling of a part of the kingdom spread in time over the whole of the country. The French party, which, we have said, existed in the South and West and even in French Burgundy, grew more powerful as the war continued, and by degrees, especially after the arms of Charles had begun to prosper, it drew to its side the mass of the people. In Normandy and Picardy the rule of England was maintained solely by mere force, and was challenged by angry and frequent risings. The policy of the Duke of Brittany was shaped in a great degree by his subjects, for the most part zealous in the cause of the Crown; and the French sympathies which prevailed in Burgundy contributed largely to induce Philip to the reconciliation effected at Arras. Even Paris, which had proclaimed the hero of Agincourt the deliverer of France, returned to her allegiance at last; the city went into mourning for Charles VI., and received Henry VI. in silence, and the people would have welcomed the army

of Charles, had that prince had the courage to approach its walls. Meanwhile—strongest proof of all, perhaps, how the feeling of loyalty grew and extended—the government which, we have said, was formed by the Dauphin at the beginning of the war, though a bad government, was not only obeyed with readiness and good will in the South and centre, but spread its authority beyond these limits. The orders and decrees of Charles's Parliaments were recognised in the East and West; the coins from his mints were current everywhere; and deputies from provinces far beyond the districts immediately under the control of his forces went to the States-General he was wont to summon. Feudal France might oppose him or stand aloof, but popular France saw its hope in him, and, comparatively weak as it was as yet, the patriotic fervour which at all times has been a characteristic of the French nation, and which has grown out of the unity of race that knit together the Gaulish tribes, and of the institutions of Imperial Rome for centuries acting on the life of Gaul, was the most powerful force that fought on his side. That force probably saved the throne of the Valois; it made the arms of Henry IV. prevail; it checked the victorious march of Marlborough, and all but wrung at Malplaquet a triumph from fate; it rolled back the coalition of Europe in the agony of 1793–4, and it may yet scare away the eagles of Prussia from their eyries of conquest at Metz and Strasburg.

One episode of the war is invested with extraordinary and tragic interest. France was not saved by the Maid of Orleans, and her arms met more than one heavy reverse after the passing away of that heroic spirit. The appearance, however, of the Maid on the scene had immense influence on the course of events. The strange spectacle of the woman in mail, with no womanly heart, in the front of the battle, breathed new life into the French soldiery, and filled their enemies with unwonted fears; until at last the mysterious Presence compelled veteran generals to retreat and awestricken fortresses to open their gates. There is no reason to doubt that these marvellous results were largely due to a general belief that a Being of more than human authority was seconding the arms and the cause of France, and that it was impossible to resist this tremendous agency. The age was one in which, in the general decay of long-settled and traditional faith, the tendency to superstition was very strong; and when the rumour spread that an unknown figure had suddenly appeared in the camp of Charles, and had revealed supernatural messages to him, and when king and prelate, noble and knight, had

declared that such deeds as these of the Maid could not have been done by mortal arms, we can comprehend how a new turn was given to the war as if by magic, and how the fortunes of France seemed changed by enchantment. It should be added, however, that the real wisdom and high capacity shown by Jeanne d'Arc account, in part at least, for the prodigious effects produced in her brief but splendid career. She greatly strengthened the cause of Charles, whose legitimacy, owing to his mother's vices, had previously been considered doubtful, by announcing, as if by a message from Heaven, that he was the 'true son of our lord Charles VI. and the rightful heir to the throne of the kingdom.' A deep policy, too, is seen in her counsel that the king should obtain the Divine sanction and that of the nation to his pretensions, by placing the crown on his head at Rheims, in the presence of the Estates of the realm; and she displayed genius in her persistent efforts to induce Charles to advance from the Loire, to march towards the North, and to approach Paris. There is something, besides, both wise and touching in her earnest advice to the worthless king, 'to place his whole trust in the providence of God, to keep faith with his loyal servants, and to be forgiving to his rebellious subjects.' And history should record that if the Maid of Orleans was invested with more than human attributes by a credulous age in a national crisis, she certainly seems to have had gifts and qualities that mark her out as a very striking character.

M. de Beaucourt's work contains several passages of interest respecting this great woman. He thus describes how the Maid first entered the presence of Charles and his Court at Chinon:—

'She was ushered into the great room of the castle. It was "at a late hour," as Jeanne has herself told us, and it was by torch-light that the Maid advanced, introduced by the Comte de Vendôme, through a crowd of knights and of men-at-arms. She was in the dress of a man, and wore the costume described by the Registrar of La Rochelle in his curious and lately published narrative—a black pourpoint, with long hose fastened to it, a short robe of black and grey, a black hood thrown over her hair, which was dark, and cut round, according to the fashion of the time. Everyone admired her simplicity, and was amazed at her easy bearing. Charles VII. had hidden himself in the ranks of his courtiers, several of whom were more gorgeously arrayed than he was, but Jeanne, guided by his voice, and "as if an angel had led her by the hand," went straight to the king, and, stopping "at a lance's distance," doffed her hood, and made obeisance, "as well," a contemporary tells us, "as if she had been bred at Court." "God grant you a good life, gentle Prince," she said. "I am not the king," replied

Charles. "There is the king," pointing to one of the lords. "In the name of God, gentle Prince," answered Jeanne, "you are the king and no other person." And she added, "I am come with a mission from God, to aid you and your kingdom; and the King of Heaven orders, through me, that you are to be crowned and anointed at Rheims, and that you are to be viceregent of the King of Heaven, who is also King of France."

An eye-witness has thus sketched the Maid in the field:—

'I saw her mount her horse, all except her head in bright armour, and with a small axe in her hand. Her horse, a large black one, was restive, and would not let her get up. She then said, "Take me to the cross." This cross was on a road before the church. She then mounted, and the horse made no more stir than if he had been tied. Turning to the entrance of the church, which was close by, she then said in a gentle woman's voice, "Priests and churchmen, fall into procession, and pray to God!" Then she went on her way; her pennon was borne by a page, and she carried her axe in her hand.'

M. de Beaucourt describes at great length the proceedings that led to the Treaty of Arras, and this is the most interesting part of his book. As we have said, Duke Philip had long shown signs of coolness towards the English alliance; and negotiations had been in progress to reconcile him with Charles VII. The chief personages who took part in them were the Constable Richmond, the Duke of Savoy, and Yolande of Anjou, the mother-in-law of Charles, an able diplomatist, with few scruples; but the most potent agency was the growing sympathy felt throughout Burgundy for the cause of France. A meeting at Lyons between a brilliant party of great French and Burgundian nobles was significant of what was ere long to follow:—

'In this splendid assembly bygone resentments were quickly forgotten; "they made great festival and rejoicings," says the chronicler, "nay, they were so cheerful that you might have thought that they had never warred together." That evening the prince had supper at the house of the Seigneur de Cisy; cups were gaily emptied; and lookers-on, amazed at the show of harmony, declared that "men were fools who got into trouble and were slain for their lords."'

After several conferences, in which leading men of the principal States of Europe took part, it was arranged that a Congress should treat for peace between England, Burgundy, and France, and should bring the disastrous war to an end. The place for the assembly was fixed at Arras, then, and long afterwards, a Burgundian town, but, after undergoing a change of sovereigns, incorporated ultimately with the Bourbon monarchy. The Congress met in July 1435, and was one of those august and majestic pageants that adorn the annals of

the Middle Ages. The Church party presided over a convocation summoned to give repose to Christendom; and prelates from all parts of the Christian world found themselves together in the old Flemish city. The great religious quarrel of the day, however, was illustrated in the significant fact that Eugenius IV. and the Council of Basle had representatives of equal rank: the Legate of the Pope was the Cardinal St. Croix; the Cardinal of Cyprus appeared for the Council. The envoys of England attest by their names the great progress already made in the community by the middle classes; they were, with scarcely an exception, of plebeian origin, but they filled the highest places in our Church and State. It was otherwise with the French ambassadors; they were princes of the blood or great nobles, though France had been really saved by the people; this was the case, too, as to those of Burgundy, and the distinction indicates the wide difference in the future destiny of the two monarchies. It should be observed, too, that Paris appears to have had special representatives of her own, significant of those claims to all but sovereign state which the capital of France has more than once asserted, and which that of England has never even thought of.

The Congress, like other meetings of the kind, was inaugurated by a round of festivities. One circumstance especially attracted notice: the representatives of England were almost isolated; those of France and Burgundy 'were as joyous friends.' On August 5 the conferences began, the Abbey of Saint Vaast having been selected as a fitting place for the august assembly, and having been decked out with becoming splendour. The opening proceedings were characteristic of the dignified order of the Middle Ages, and of the skill of the Church in maintaining the attitude of a great moral arbiter in affairs of State:—

'Some difficulties were made on the point of precedence; but at last the Cardinal of Cyprus took his seat a little below the Cardinal St. Croix. As soon as the Duke of Burgundy entered the enclosure, the Cardinal of Cyprus rose and went to meet him, as far as the door, a courtesy which the Cardinal St. Croix could not render, for he had hurt his foot. The duke saluted the two cardinals, and took his seat below them. . . . Three enclosures had been laid out—one for the cardinals, another for the English ambassadors, a third for the French. Next day the envoys of Charles VII. appeared before the two cardinals, between eight and nine in the morning, in the enclosure where the opening of the sittings had taken place. The conferences began by a discourse by the Archbishop of Albi, who chose as his text, "Peace on earth and good will to men." The Archbishop of Rheims made answer in the name of the king, and gave thanks to the cardinals and

the speaker. . . . In the evening, at four o'clock, the cardinals held a sitting to receive the ambassadors of England. A discourse was preached by the Bishop of Wexio, whose text was, "Be at peace with one another, and the God of peace and love will be with you." The Archbishop of York thanked him "proudly, and in a stately way," and declared that the intentions of his sovereign were pacific.'

The name of the prelate was John Kempe; in the spirit of English Churchmen of the time, he made this protest as the debates began :—

'He declared, in the name of his master, and in the presence of the cardinals, that the King of England, in temporal matters, acknowledged no other superior than God; and that in appearing by his representatives before the Congress, he did not admit that he appeared before judges, but only before friendly arbitrators, and mediators to arrange peace.'

We shall not dwell on the conferences that ensued. The English ambassadors proposed a truce of even thirty years between the belligerents, their object doubtless being to gain time, until Henry VI. should have attained full maturity; they were disposed, too, to make some concessions; but they rejected the notion of a final peace, and they steadily refused to forego the claim of their sovereign to the crown of France. The French envoys, on the other hand, were willing to cede the districts held by the English armies, but they insisted that these should remain subject to the suzerainty of the King of France. They stipulated, too, for a permanent treaty; and, above all, they declared that Charles must be recognised as rightful King of France, believing probably that with these conditions he would speedily recover his entire kingdom. It was impossible to reconcile these conflicting pretensions, and the negotiations were at last broken off.

'On the 31st of August, the Archbishop of York, in the name of the plenipotentiaries of England, communicated to the cardinals his answer to the French ultimatum. The propositions were rejected; the King of England would not renounce his sovereignty over France, or at least over his possessions in France. The ambassadors expressed their gratitude to the Sovereign Pontiff, and to the Council of Basle, also to the cardinals, and the other delegates of the Pope and the council, for their efforts to make peace.'

The annexation of Aquitaine to the crown of France was not accomplished until a later period, which does not fall within the volume now under review; but that great event also belongs to the annals of this reign. Mr. Freeman emphatically says, in his valuable synopsis of the historical geography of Europe, 'France, in the sense which the word bears in modern

'use, may date its complete existence from the addition of 'Bordeaux to the dominions of Charles VII.' But we must return to Arras.

The English embassy having been courteously dismissed, it was not difficult to make a separate peace between Burgundy and France. Duke Philip was pledged to the English alliance, and had sworn to treat Charles as a faithless enemy; but learned casuists removed his scruples, and the Church absolved him from an inconvenient oath. Large concessions of territory were made to him; he was relieved from homage to the King of France for his life, as a mark of extraordinary personal favour; but his descendants were not exempt from a vassalage which in certain circumstances might become dependence. The scene which took place when the treaty was signed was a remarkable and impressive spectacle:—

'On the 21st of September a great religious ceremony was witnessed in the church of Saint Vaast. The Duke of Burgundy, surrounded by the princes of his House, and by his counsellors, knights, and squires, took his seat at the right of the choir. The ambassadors of France were seated at the left. A small altar had been raised in the middle of the church; and the Gospels, with a crucifix, had been placed upon it between two golden candlesticks. The Cardinal of Cyprus celebrated the Mass of the Holy Ghost; . . . and then Philip Mangart, Master of Requests, read a document publishing the treaty. . . . The spectators, unable to restrain their delight, broke out into acclamations. Cries of "Noël, Noël!" echoed under the roof of the sacred edifice, so that, as an eye-witness expressed it, you "could not hear the name of God." The cardinals then took their places in the middle of the choir. . . . An ancient priest was then seen to rise and, moving towards the right of the choir, fall on his knees before Philip of Burgundy. It was Jean Tudert, an Elder of Paris, one of the ambassadors of the king. . . . According to the form that had been arranged beforehand, the Elder spoke in a loud voice these words: "That the death of Duke John, "whom may God absolve, had been wickedly and maliciously com-
"passed, and had given displeasure to the king, who was then very
"young and had not been able to devise a remedy." . . . This humiliating confession having been made, the duke raised Jean Tudert, and, having embraced him, declared that, with the help of God, he would keep his word, and that there never would be war again between the king and himself. . . . Upon this, Philip rose in his turn, and went towards the cardinals. The Cardinal Saint Croix removed the Host from its receptacle, and elevated it. He then took a golden crucifix, and laid it on a cushion. "Swear," he said, "never to bear in mind
"the death of your father, and faithfully to maintain peace and union
"with the king, your sovereign lord, and with his subjects, in accord-
"ance with the treaty." The duke, placing his hand on the crucifix, took the oath. The two cardinals, laying their hands on the duke's head, pronounced him absolved from his oath to the English. The

princes, ambassadors, and lords, who were present, came in turn to swear that they would observe the treaty.'

Our view of the character of Charles VII. is strongly confirmed by these volumes, notwithstanding M. de Beaucourt's efforts to make as favourable a case for the king as possible. It is significant that at the very age when he would have given proof of energy and will had he had a manly and daring nature, he shrank out of sight and was, so to speak, effaced.

'At this time he seems to have passed through one of those transformations of which his long career offers more than one example. Instead of taking an active part in public life, of placing himself at the head of his troops, or of showing himself to his people, he shuts himself up within retreats impenetrable alike to his subjects and to history, conduct for which one of his council, with courageous frankness, will afterwards reproach him. Thenceforward he will only appear before us at distant intervals of time, and we shall no longer behold him doing his duty as king with persevering energy.'

How weak Charles was, and how easily led, is also seen in passages like these:—

'His faults begin to show themselves at this period of his life; we recognise in the Dauphin an unfortunate tendency to submit to the ascendancy of those who are around him, and to be blind to their misconduct, even to the extent of bearing everything at their hands. 'The year that precedes his accession to the throne attests an ominous change in his nature; the ardour of his first youth is replaced by a kind of slackness, and the young prince seems to prefer new-comers who have gained his good graces to the old and faithful councillors who had watched over his infancy.'

There is ample proof of the profligate waste of Charles, even when he seemed at the brink of ruin. For example:—

'We must admit that the Court of Bourges indulged in a prodigality in deplorable contrast with the bankrupt state of its finances. In October, the Dauphin orders a magnificent sword, called a "Turkish sword;" in November he gives an order of 40,000 livres to buy horses for his own use; in December he orders a robe of black cloth, the sleeves of which were covered with silver-gilt lace, worth sixteen marks. . . . The sword cost 3,300 livres, the finery on the robe 2,000.'

Charles was doubtless liberal, in the sense that he squandered his subjects' means on rapacious favourites, like many of his successors. We quote instances of a 'good nature' which, as was said of Calonne, France had reason to dread:—

'From 1418 to 1422, we find a very large sum spent in gifts of money, of horses, and of lands. Tanguy du Chastel had for his "personal maintenance" a monthly pension of 1,000 livres tournois from August 1419. Pierre Froton receives for his marriage 10,000

livres tournois. Pierre de Beauveau receives 600 livres, Hugues de Ure 2,000, and Tanguy du Chastel, again, 2,000 livres. . . . The gifts of horses present a formidable list; and those of estates were to a large extent.'

The false and distrustful nature of Charles, so clearly brought out by the hand of Shakespeare, who reproduced the traditions of his day, was conspicuously seen in his conduct to Jeanne d'Arc. M. de Beaucourt attempts to excuse the king; but he really makes no excuse whatever:—

'We ask, without having any intention—we say it in all sincerity—of pleading extenuating circumstances on behalf of the king—what could Charles VII. do, slave as he was of unworthy advisers? Had he ever wished to come to the assistance of the Maid, would he have had the power? The true fault of Charles VII. was not the ingratitude with which his memory is reproached, it was his political incapacity; and was he alone to blame for this?'

These volumes abound in curious details respecting the government of Charles VII. That government, in its leading men, was a bad government, in every sense of the word, rapacious, selfish, mean, and unscrupulous. During the period between 1413 and 1435, it passed through three distinct phases, and was composed of personages of very different types; but it was throughout the same in its essential features. The first ministers of Charles VII. were either chiefs of the Armagnac faction, or councillors chosen by Yolande of Anjou: and they were, in many instances, men of low origin, a bureaucracy filling the high places of the State. The disaster of Vernenil drove these from the helm; and they were succeeded by a Junta of Nobles, headed by Richmond as Constable of France; and these in turn gave place to the rule of the chief of the great House of La Tremoille, who for years enjoyed a complete ascendancy. Of these administrations the first, we think, was the ablest and the most loyal to the Crown; that of Richmond was marked by repeated efforts at reconciling Charles with his great feudatories; that of La Tremoille stands out prominently as the domination of a worthless favourite. But the three Governments were stained alike by treachery and deeds of revenge and crime; and they were characterised by the same corruption, by the same kinds of iniquitous wrong, by the same contempt of the just rights of the people. The ministers of Charles seldom hesitated at getting rid of inconvenient persons by assassination, and devices of the kind; they all grew rich on the plunder of the Crown; and their financial expedients mainly consisted in levying taxes without stint or scruple, and in debasing the coinage to

suit their purpose. Even their diplomacy, which appears to be their strongest point, owed its success to causes external to them; and it is another proof of the vitality of France that she was able to endure the rule of these harpies. The following shows how tradition preserved a record of the infamy of the deeds of La Tremoille:—

‘It is impossible to get at the bottom of the history of this period of six years, when the government was in the hands of La Tremoille. It is stated that documents doubtless very injurious to his memory were destroyed in the last century. What acts of meanness, of baseness, and of crime, would have been brought to light had the list been complete! What strikes one most, as you look closely at the matter, is the insolent opulence of the Chamberlain, in painful contrast with the poverty to which the king and queen had been reduced. La Tremoille lends to everybody; he holds, through his purse, all the Court in subjection.’

This misgovernment, however, of Charles and his ministers was corrected by the patriotic energy and practical sense of the French nation. It is interesting to read how the judges and lawyers who composed the Parliament and bar of Paris left their homes regularly to administer justice in the provinces under the royal authority, and how town after town made large sacrifices to furnish supplies to the royal exchequer. It is chiefly, however, in the acts and the language of the States-General which Charles convened, that we see most clearly the attitude taken, in this period of trial, by the great body of Frenchmen. The States-General, indeed, made no pretensions to the influence and the power of the English Parliament, at this time nearly supreme in the State; they did not attempt to control the king; they scarcely protested against the abuses which were weakening and bringing disgrace on the monarchy. But they tendered counsels which, if somewhat timid, were rational, sober, and founded in wisdom; and they acknowledged the great truths, that trust in God, obedience to the ruling powers and the law, and union in the various orders of the State, form the best means, in a national crisis, of working out a national deliverance. We quote from M. de Beaucourt's work the following impressive and touching passages; how strikingly they contrast with the disloyal treachery, and with the godless, foolish, and concited utterances, of French Assemblies since the Revolution when confronted by national defeat and misfortune:—

‘We possess the text of the “Advice proposed by the Three Estates;” the soul of France is to be found in these documents, inspired by a noble patriotism, but hitherto unknown to historians. The deputies, at the outset, declare that in their “observations and

"requests" they do not intend "to interfere with the government or the authority of the Regent," but that, in all things, like good subjects, they submit themselves "to the ordinances and rule of the Prince and his Council." They thank God for "the favour He has shown the Regent," in "preserving him from danger, and giving him virtue, good sense, understanding, and the determination to love God and to govern as a Catholic ruler." . . . They entreat the Dauphin "chiefly to commit his cause to God, and to pray for the support of the Church and the wisest men of his kingdom." They beg of him to bring "back to himself his relations, and to become reconciled with them; to be merciful to those of his subjects who may submit, to forget all injuries, and to conquer evil by good." They advise him further "to keep on good terms with his allies . . . to take particular care of the towns and people of Normandy who shall submit, to allow no pillage, and to enter into the territory that had been regained like a lord who was recovering his lordship and liberating his subjects from tyranny and captivity." They "implore the Dauphin to bear in mind the sacrifices made by his subjects . . . that his government shall be conducted by wise men, in small number, and chosen by royal ordinance, and . . . to have worthy and famous lords in his council, and in all things to pay attention to what the council may recommend."

M. de Beaucourt makes the following remarks on what, in his judgment, is the lesson conveyed by this part of the reign of Charles VII.: --

'The power of the monarchical principle never displayed itself more conspicuously than during the later years of the reign of Charles VI. France had fallen low, divided as she was into two camps, and having become the theatre of an embittered contest, besides being trampled under foot by a pitiless enemy who relentlessly pursued his success, and being betrayed by those who ought to have been her defenders. Yet she could still hope, for she preserved her dynasty. Royalty was there; the traditional institution survived, respected by all, and it was under the ægis of this that the country was about to rise from its ruins. If King Charles VI. is incapable of taking part in affairs of State, his son exercises power in his name, with the title of Lieutenant-General of the kingdom. . . . Young Charles is then truly king, recognised as such by all loyal Frenchmen, and by the Powers connected with the monarchy by treaties, until the day when the death of his father shall transmit to him that crown which his enemies have tried in vain to take away from him. Assuredly if France, having accepted the yoke of John the Fearless and his son, had withdrawn herself from her allegiance to the Dauphin, had she consented to the treaty which denounced him as unworthy of the crown and fallen from the throne, the fate of our country would have been sealed. The Dauphin Charles is entitled to the honour of having saved the national independence, illustrating in this way a truth attested by our whole history, that the safety of France lies in her fidelity to the principle of her traditional monarchy.'

These observations contain some truth, though we should say that the moral of the time is that the crisis through which France passed bears witness to her intense vitality and to the inherent force of her national unity. When M. de Beaucourt, however, hints—he believes, doubtless, in the Legitimist faith—that the hope of France in the nineteenth century rests in her trust in the elder branch of the Bourbons, he disregards the plain teachings of history. At one time, indeed, and even for centuries, the monarchy was the main prop of the nation, the great central force which, as it were, informed the frame that sustained the national life. But this was because, in those days, the monarchy was the worthiest and best embodiment of the State, because it really was a beneficent power, which contributed to the national welfare, by establishing order, government, and law, in the place of anarchy and oppressive feudalism. All this has been wholly changed long ago; the monarchy, as represented by the Count de Chambord, is associated in the memory of Frenchmen with the destructive despotism and arbitrary acts of Louis XIV.; with the humiliating reign of his worthless successor; with the weakness of Louis XVI.; with the blind bigotry of Charles X.; and it represents ideas, traditions, and faiths, repugnant to the great mass of the people. To plead now for the ancient monarchy is deliberately to forget the march of events, and how the old order gives place to the new; and those who urge its claims are not, we believe, pursuing a wise or a patriotic course. Yet France at this moment stands as much in need of a really stable and lasting government as at any period since the Revolution; and it seems unlikely that a Republic, unsustained, we suspect, by popular sympathy, and out of accord with the order of Europe, or that a military despotism on two occasions overtaken by the most frightful disasters, will permanently supply that great national want. But the study of the past history of France teaches at least this lesson, that she has survived and surmounted even greater perils than these.

- ART. VII.—1. *An Account of Indian Serpents, collected on the Coast of Coromandel. Containing Descriptions and Drawings of each Species, together with Experiments and Remarks on their several Poisons.* By PATRICK RUSSELL, M.D., F.R.S. In two vols. folio. London: 1796.
2. *North American Herpetology; or, a Description of the Reptiles inhabiting the United States.* By J. E. HOLBROOK, M.D. Philadelphia: 1842.
3. *The Reptiles of British India.* By ALBERT C. L. G. GUNTHER, M.D., Ray Society. London: 1864.
4. *The Snakes of Australia.* An illustrated and descriptive Catalogue of all the known Species. By GERARD KREFFT, F.L.S., C.M.L.S. Sydney: 1869.
5. *Indian Snakes.* An Elementary Treatise on Ophiology in India, &c. By EDWARD NICHOLSON. Madras: 1870.
6. *The Thanotophidia of India,* being a Description of the Venomous Snakes of the Indian Peninsula, with an Account of the Influence of their Poison on Life, and a Series of Experiments. By J. FAYRER, M.D., C.S.I., F.R.S.E. London: 1872.
7. *Snakes.* Curiosities and Wonders of Serpent Life. By CATHERINE C. HOPEY. London: 1882.

OF all the creatures that exist, whether of land, sea, or air, there is not one which is so generally looked upon with feelings of aversion and horror as the serpent. Doubtless these natural feelings are mixed up with some amount of prejudice and ignorance, but the fact of the existence in several species of snakes of a deadly poisonous apparatus, which is able, in the course of a few hours or even of a few minutes, to destroy active and healthy life, is enough to account for, if not altogether to justify, the almost universal abhorrence in which these creatures are held. In vain do we seek to appeal to the elegance of the body, the polished surface of the gleaming scales, so beautifully and symmetrically arranged, the colours often brilliant and of varied tasteful patterns, and above all, perhaps, to the serpent's graceful motions, which struck the mind of Agur the son of Jakeh when he mentioned 'the way of a serpent upon a rock' * as one

* Prov. xxx. 19. דֶּרֶךְ נָחָשׁ, '*derec nakhash*,' well explained by Rosenmüller as '*non vestigium viæ, sed agendi ratio*'—i.e. 'mode of progression.'

of the four things which were too wonderful for him. We may admire in the serpent all that is worthy of our admiration whether in external appearance or in the structural adaptability of its several parts to their respective functions, but we cannot eliminate from the mind, without an effort, the terrible fact that several kinds are armed with a most deadly power, and in consequence we are apt to put the harmless species in the same category with the venomous, and to condemn the whole generation of vipers simply because they possess the serpent's form and the serpent's tongue. Moreover it must be conceded that there is a most repulsive look which many species habitually wear; the fixed cold glare of the eye with its frequent linear pupil; the threatening aspect, the dark lurid colour of some kinds, the black and yellow wasp-like markings of others, all these are calculated to inspire fear and aversion. And even the naturalist finds it difficult to divest his mind of these feelings, although he is perfectly well aware that the poisonous kinds are far outnumbered both in families and in individuals by the innocuous. It is quite true that very often a venomous snake reveals its character by the form of its head and by its threatening conduct when excited; but there is no general rule by which to judge, on mere external inspection, whether a species is innocent or harmless; many of the *Hydrophidae* or sea snakes, for instance, all of which are highly poisonous, betray in outward form no visible mark of their deadly nature. Speaking of a species of *Trigonocephalus*, on the other hand, which the late Mr. Charles Darwin observed in Bahia Blanca, South America, he says:—

‘The expression of this snake's face was hideous and fierce; the pupil consisted of a vertical slit in a mottled and coppery iris; the jaws were broad at the base, and the nose terminated in a triangular projection. I do not think I ever saw anything more ugly, excepting, perhaps, some of the vampire bats. I imagine this repulsive aspect originates from the features being placed in positions, with respect to each other, somewhat proportional to those of the human face; and thus we obtain a scale of hideousness.’ *

The form of a snake is more or less familiar to every one; but that, when closely examined, discloses, in some instances, something of its past history. In systematic zoology, snakes form the order *Ophidia* of the class *Reptilia*. The order is thus characterised by Dr. Günther, one of the greatest authorities on such subjects:—

‘Body exceedingly elongate, without limbs, or with merely rudi-

* Naturalist's Voyage round the World, p. 97.

ments of limbs, scarcely visible from without; the ribs are articulated movably with the vertebral column; no sternum; generally both jaws and the palate toothed; the mandibles united in front by an elastic ligament, and generally very extensible. Eyelids none. Integuments with numerous scale-like folds, rarely tubercular.'

It is not popularly known that any snakes possess rudiments of limbs; but this curious and instructive fact occurs in the boa constrictor, and indeed in all the family *Pythonidæ*, which have vestiges, very minute it is true, but undoubted vestiges, of hind limbs, mere spines or scales, close to the vent; and this peculiarity clearly demonstrates a remote relationship in past ages to the Sauria or order of lizards; these last-named creatures have often, and generally, four well-defined limbs, as in the familiar example of our common English lizard (*Lacerta agilis*), but there are lizards which have these organs in a very imperfect state, as the *Saurophis* of Southern Africa, whose four little legs are too feeble to aid it much in progression; or the anterior limbs may be entirely wanting, while the posterior are represented by very rudimentary bodies wholly useless for progression, as in the Australian *Pygopus*, and the *Ophiodes* of Brazil. So again, there are some saurians which closely resemble most snakes in the entire absence of any external vestiges of limbs, as in the so-called Javelin snake (*Acontias meleagris*) of South Africa, the worm-like *Amphisbæna alba* of Brazil, and the *Pseudopus* or Scheltopusik of Dalmatia and Asia Minor, while again the Ophidia are connected with the Amphibia—the Snakes, that is, with the Frogs and Salamanders—by the apodous *Cæcilia*, of serpent-form body. It is difficult, therefore, to distinguish by any fixed line of demarcation the group of snakes from the group of lizards, if we regard mere external characters; but on examining the internal parts the distinctness of the two orders Ophidia and Sauria becomes in many cases more evident, so far as relates to existing species. But what do the rudimentary scale-like vestiges of the hind limbs in the *Pythonidæ* teach us? Surely no other lesson than one of evolution in some way or other; that these vestiges, now rudimentary or altogether absent in snakes, did at one period of their history exist as well-developed hind limbs formed for limb-like progression; just as the limbless lizards referred to above are modifications, as Dr. P. Martin Duncan well observes, by a degenerative process, of reptiles which did not crawl on their belly, but had those organs in perfection which are rudimentary or absent in the serpent. These scale-like vestiges in the boa are as surely manifestations of a quondam more perfectly formed limb, as are the splint-bones of the

modern horse the manifestations of the existence of an equine animal which originally possessed four or five toes with the corresponding metacarpal and metatarsal bones, which palæontozoical evidence has made us acquainted with. There is, however, at present this difference in the palæontological evidence, derived from fossil remains, as to the earliest forms of the snake and the horse: that in the latter case we have, as Professor Marsh has shown, a perfect series of fossil forms in America, which, beginning with the small ancestral type of *Orohippus*, is gradually modified in size, limb bones, and teeth to forms barely distinguishable, specifically, from the horse of to-day; whereas, at present, we are not acquainted with any early ancestral ophidian forms which show the existence of former perfect locomotive limb bones; for the oldest known remains that have yet been found occur, we believe, in the eocene formation of the Isle of Sheppey, and these ophidian remains appear to have been large species belonging to the Pythonidæ. So far, then, the geological evidence is imperfect, and we still need actual proof of the former existence of a snake with well-developed differentiated progressional limbs.

Another interesting question presents itself. Perhaps there is no group of vertebrate animals which exhibits more instructive differences in their present geographical distribution than the Ophidia, or presents more striking proofs of the changes that have taken place in the disposition of land and water. The Ophidia are pre-eminently a tropical order; they diminish in numbers as we go north in the temperate zone; they cease altogether long before we reach the Arctic circle; they are more dependent on climate than all other reptiles; at 62° north latitude they cease altogether; they are not found on very lofty mountains, not ascending higher than 6,000 feet in the Alps. Some species are found in deserts, others prefer swamps and marshes, many are adapted for a ground or an arboreal life amidst almost impenetrable forests. Many are excellent swimmers; but with the exception of the *Hydrophidæ*, or sea snakes, none are capable of making journeys in the seas, and they are rarely found on oceanic islands. How, then, can we account for the fact of the existence of the same families of snakes in countries separated one from another by vast expanses of sea water? Mr. Wallace, in his very valuable work on 'The Geographical Distribution of Animals,' following in the main the system first, we believe, suggested by Dr. Sclater, maps out the zoogeographical regions of the earth into these six divisions:—(1) The Palæarctic, which includes all temperate Europe and Asia from Iceland to Behring Strait.

and from the Azores to Japan; it comprises all the extra-tropical part of the Sahara and Arabia, and all Persia, Cabul, and Beloochistan to the Indus, and the northern half of China. (2) The Ethiopian, which comprises all Africa southward of the Sahara and its islands, and the southern half of Arabia. (3) The Oriental, which consists of all India and the southern part of China; all the Malay peninsula and islands as far east as Java, Borneo, and the Philippine Islands, and Formosa. (4) The Australian, which comprises Australia, the Celebes, New Guinea, and the Solomon Islands, the tropical islands of the Pacific, and New Zealand. (5) The Neotropical, which comprises the great central mass of South America, Central America, and the West India Islands; and (6) The Nearctic Region, which comprises all temperate North America and Greenland. The twenty-five known families of snakes are thus distributed: six are found in the Nearctic region, ten in the Palæarctic, thirteen in the Australian, sixteen in the Neotropical, seventeen in the Ethiopian, and no less than twenty-two in the Oriental, which last is thus seen to be by far the richest of the great regions in the variety of its forms of ophidian life. 'The only regions,' Mr. Wallace remarks, 'that possess altogether peculiar families of this order' 'are the Ethiopian (S. African sub-region), and the Oriental' ' (Southern India and Ceylon); the usually rich and peculiar' ' Neotropical region not possessing, exclusively, any family of' ' snakes; and what is still more remarkable, the Neotropical' ' and Australian regions together do not possess a family' ' peculiar to them. Every family inhabiting these two regions' ' is found also in the Oriental.' In other words, the same families of snakes are found in South America, Australia, and India and as these countries are now separated by ocean waters which snakes could not have travelled over, the question arises, How came they there? Mr. Wallace remarks that this fact, taken in connexion with the superior richness of the Oriental region both in families and genera, would indicate that the Ophidia had their origin in the northern hemisphere of the Old World (the ancient Palæarctic region), whence they spread on all sides, in successive waves of migration, to the other regions; that at some geological period Australia and South America were each united with some part of the northern hemisphere, and that the Palæarctic and Oriental regions are probably the source whence other regions were supplied with snakes and other forms of animal life.

Of the twenty-five families of snakes enumerated by naturalists, six families are known to be more or less poisonous, in-

cluding about two hundred and twenty species; the whole number of species, both venomous and harmless, being about one thousand three hundred; India being conspicuous for the mortality caused by the bites of these poisonous creatures.

The different kinds of snakes are thus distinguished by Dr. Günther in his work on 'The Reptiles of British India:—

'1. *Burrowing snakes*, living under ground, only occasionally appearing above the surface. They are distinguished by a rigid cylindrical body, short tail, narrow mouth, small head not distinct from the neck, little teeth in small number, and by the absence or feeble development of the ventral shields. They feed chiefly on small invertebrate animals. None of them are venomous.

'2. *Ground snakes*, or species which live above ground, and only occasionally climb bushes or enter the water; their body is more or less cylindrical, very flexible in every part, and of moderate proportions. Their ventral shields are broad. They feed chiefly on terrestrial vertebrate animals. By far the greater number of snakes belong to this category, and it is represented by many variations in all the three sub-orders.

'3. *Tree snakes*, or species passing the greater part of their life on bushes and trees, which they climb with the greatest facility. They are distinguished either by an exceedingly slender body, with broad, sometimes carinated ventral shields, or by a prehensile tail. Many of the species are characterised by their vivid coloration, of which green forms the principal part. . . . They feed on animals which have a mode of life similar to their own; only a few species on eggs.

'4. *Fresh-water snakes*, distinguished by the position of the nostrils, which are placed on the top of the snout, and by a tapering tail. They inhabit fresh waters, and are, therefore, excellent swimmers and divers; only a few species (which also in external characters approach the following group, that of the true sea snakes) venture out to sea. They feed on fish, frogs, crustacea, and other water animals, and are viviparous. None are venomous.

'5. *Sea snakes*, distinguished by a strongly compressed tail, and by the position of the nostrils, which are placed as in the last group. They live in the sea only, occasionally approaching the land, feed on marine fish, are viviparous and venomous. One genus only (*Platurus*) has the ventral shields so much developed as to be able to move on land.'

The 'way of a serpent upon a rock' was first definitely and accurately described by Sir Everard Home. It is now well known that the instruments of progression in the Ophidia are the numerous ribs, which in some of the larger pythons are several hundred in number. The whole under surface of a snake's body is provided with broad plates, called *scuta*, the posterior margins of which are free.

'When the snake,' says Sir E. Home, 'begins to put itself in motion,

the ribs of the opposite sides are drawn apart from each other, and the small cartilages at the end of them are bent upon the upper surfaces of the abdominal scuta, on which the ends of the ribs rest; and as the ribs move in pairs, the scutum under each pair is carried along with it. This scutum, by its posterior edge, lays hold of the ground and becomes a fixed point from whence to set out anew. This motion is beautifully seen when a snake is climbing over an angle to get upon a flat surface. When the animal is moving, it alters its shape from a circular or an oval form to something approaching a triangle, of which the surface on the ground forms the base. The coluber and the boa having large abdominal scuta, which may be considered as hoofs or shoes, are the best fitted for this kind of progressive motion. . . . An observation of Sir Joseph Banks during the exhibition of a coluber of unusual size first led to this discovery. While it was moving briskly along the carpet, he said, he thought he saw the ribs come forward in succession, like the feet of a caterpillar. This remark led me to examine the animal's motion with more accuracy, and on putting the hand under its belly, while the snake was in the act of passing over the palm, the ends of the ribs were distinctly felt pressing upon the surface in regular succession, so as to leave no doubt of the ribs forming so many pairs of levers, by which the animal moves its body from place to place.'

The free posterior margins of the python's large abdominal scuta may be readily seen by any one who is afraid of handling these creatures alive, in their cast-off skins, a good specimen of which is before us as we write; but those who, like Miss Hopley, are not afraid of the harmless snakes, may satisfy themselves of the efficiency of these scuta as levers of progression by allowing some tame specimen in the gardens of the Zoological Society to crawl along the arms and body. A surface more or less rough is necessary for the action of the scuta, for snakes are incapable of moving over a perfectly smooth surface. .

The ability of some of the snakes, as notably in the Pythonidæ, to swallow prey the size of which is greater than that of their heads and necks, would seem to be impossible were it not a spectacle familiar to many observers. Stomachs and viscera of all animals are more or less elastic, and sufficiently dilatable to allow of the passage of a large mass of food; but not so, as a rule, with the mouth, whose bones are generally fixed and unyielding. In snakes the bones of the mouth are not fixed, and allow an immense expansion. The lower jaw is not hinged to the upper jaw, but is connected by a long (tympanic) bone to the posterior part of the skull by ligaments and muscles so as to permit great movability. As Sir Joseph Fayrer has said:—

'It is the peculiar structure of the jaws that forms one of the chief

characteristics of the ophidians. The bones which compose the upper jaw and palate, as well as the mandibles, are freely movable, the latter being loosely hung from the tympanic bones and united in front by ligament. The mastoid bones with which the tympanic bones articulate are also movable, so that the distensibility of the mouth is very great, as it often needs to be, to enable the snake to swallow prey larger in diameter than itself. The mechanism of deglutition in the Ophidia is very remarkable: the mouth can not only be opened vertically, but transversely; and further, each lateral half has the power of separate and independent motion, which is called into action when the prey is swallowed. By the continual action of the jaws and teeth, the animal brought within the grasp of the mouth is slowly drawn in and engulfed; it is first held firmly by the sharp recurved teeth, one side of the jaw is then protruded, the teeth being withdrawn to be again implanted further on; the same process is repeated alternately on either side, until the prey is finally drawn within the grasp of the gullet. This is the mode of deglutition in the python and other non-venomous snakes. A similar process, with certain modifications in the dental arrangement, obtains in the poisonous snakes; the chief structural distinction being found in the maxillary teeth, which in them are long, sharp, recurved, and perforated fangs, through which the secretion of the poison gland is hypodermically injected into the bitten animal.*

Great as are the python's or the boa's powers of swallowing large bodies, the accounts which travellers give of them must not always be too implicitly believed. Such tales are often very much exaggerated, and generally discredited by naturalists. Full-sized deer with well-grown antlers would be too much for the largest of the Pythonidæ. Mr. Krefft, who has paid much attention to the snakes of Australia, says:—

‘Such stories as Waterton tells of his Dutch friend who killed a boa 22 feet long that had a pair of stag's horns in its mouth, and was apparently waiting for the body just swallowed to be digested, are nothing but *canards*; Du Chaillu and other sensational authors have followed in his footsteps; the illustrations given by them of African pythons are about on a par with the well-known engraving representing a boa, apparently about forty feet long, being ripped up by a negro, while it is swinging from the branch of a tree. The present generation will not believe such exaggerations, for when the foot-rule is applied to the monsters in question, they dwindle down to more ordinary size.’

Dr. Günther's remarks are to the same effect. Speaking of the Indian *Python reticulatus*, the Ular sawa of the Malays, and the *P. molurus*, the Adjiger of the Hindoos, he writes:—

‘The two species of Indian rock snakes are among the largest of living reptiles. Of snakes only their African congeners and the American *Eunectes murinus* can be placed beside them. Their dimensions and

their strength, however, have been much exaggerated. Specimens of 18 to 20 feet in length are very rare, although isolated statements of the occurrence of individuals which measured 30 feet are on record and worthy of credit. We regret to find in the "Reise der Novara," ii. p. 247, a passage in which it is stated that the travellers saw in Manilla a living "boa constrictor" 48 feet long and 7 inches thick. Surely none of the naturalists accompanying the expedition can have seen this passage before it went to press. Rock snakes from 15 to 20 feet long have the thickness of a man's thigh, and will easily overpower a small deer, a sheep, or a good-sized dog. But although able to kill these animals, the width of their mouth is not so large that they can swallow one larger than a half-grown sheep.'

As a general rule snakes are oviparous, and lay eggs of an oblong form, with a soft leathery membrane for a shell; the egg chains of our common English snake (*Tropidonotus natrix*) are familiar to many observers. Oviparous snakes leave their eggs to be developed by the warmth of the place where they have been deposited. The pythons have for some years been known to incubate their eggs, and this they have done in confinement; the Indian *P. molurus* has bred in Paris, and the African *P. sebae* in London; the mother in both cases sat upon the eggs, but only those of the Indian species were successfully hatched. The female of *P. molurus* deposited fifteen eggs, about the size of that of a goose, on May 6, collected them in a conical heap, coiled herself spirally round and on this heap, entirely covering the eggs, so that her head rested in the centre and at the top of the cone; she remained in this position till July 3, when eight of the eggs were hatched. An increase of the temperature was observed between the coils of the snakes, so that a higher degree of warmth is, probably, necessary for the development of the embryonic pythons than for that of other snakes. Some snakes (the fresh-water and poisonous species) are viviparous, the young being produced in the oviduct of the mother or at the time of the exclusion of the ova. The female snake is larger than the male, and there are certain differences in colour which may distinguish the sexes; but with the exception of the poisonous sea snakes, the *Hydrophidæ*, which have, in the male, a swelling on each side of the tail, there is no external character to distinguish the sex.

The sea snakes just mentioned are highly poisonous. They inhabit the salt-water estuaries and tidal streams, and are widely distributed, being found in the Indian and Pacific Oceans, from Madagascar to the Isthmus of Panama. Sir Joseph Fayrer mentions several species of these sea snakes which are found on the Indian coasts. The family is thus generally described:—

‘The sea snakes have great varieties of form, but the transitions from one to another are very gradual. Some of them attain a considerable size. Günther speaks of some species attaining to the length of twelve feet. The longest I have seen is under five feet; there is no reason to believe that they attain to so great a size as certain fabulous stories would suggest. They are very poisonous. The case related of a sailor of H.M.S. “Algerine” who was bitten by one recently caught at Madras, proves them to be so. I am informed by Mr. Galiffe that a fisherman bitten by a salt-water snake somewhere near the Salt Lakes, died in one hour and a quarter. And your experiments and those of Mr. Stewart at Pooree prove that not only when able to bite voluntarily, but even when weak and unable to bite when the jaws were compressed on the animal, death resulted. The fishermen on the coast know their dangerous properties and carefully avoid them. They have smaller jaws and much smaller fangs than the land snakes generally, with open grooves, though not always completely open, as supposed by some naturalists; but the virus is very active, and appears to act as speedily and certainly as that of the terrestrial poisonous colubrine snakes. They have an elongated body like the land snakes; in some instances it is short and thick, whilst in others it is very thick towards the tail, and most disproportionately elongated and attenuated in the neck; the head is very minute. The hinder part of the body and tail is flattened and compressed vertically, almost like the fin or tail of a fish, and it answers the same purpose, for with it they swim with grace and rapidity. They swim like fish, and live, with some exceptions, continually in the sea or tidal water. When thrown on the land by the surf, as they constantly are at Pooree and other places along the coast, they are helpless and almost blind. Their food consists of fish and other aquatic animals, which they pursue and overtake in the salt water. There are certain parts of the Bay of Bengal in which they are often seen in great numbers, and their movements in the clear blue water are very agile, graceful, and beautiful.’ (P. 23.)

The order Ophidia of the class Reptilia is divided by naturalists into the three following sub-divisions: 1. *Ophidii colubriiformes*, innocuous snakes; 2. *Ophidii colubriiformes venenosi*, or poisonous colubrine snakes; 3. *Ophidii viperiiformes*, or viperine snakes, poisonous. The two last sub-orders are referred by Sir Joseph Fayrer, under the designation of Thanatophidia (death snakes), to those species which occur in India and in the Bengal Presidency. The first sub-order comprises all those snakes which are without grooved or perforated fang-like teeth in front; the second sub-order includes all those snakes which have an erect, immovable, grooved, or perforated tooth in front of the maxillary; the third sub-order contains snakes with a long, perforated, erectile fang on the maxillary which is extremely short, without any other teeth. In the British Isles there are only three species of indigenous snakes, namely, the ringed snake (*Tropidonotus natrix*), the small

crowned smooth snake (*Coronella lævis*), a well-known continental species, first ascertained to belong to the British fauna by Mr. Bartlett and Dr. Günther in 1862, and the viper (*Pelias berus*), which alone is poisonous. The first two belong to the harmless colubrines; the last, as its English name implies, to the viperine sub-order. The first sub-order contains nineteen families, the second four, and the last two families. The venomous colubrine snakes comprise, according to Dr. Günther, the four families of (1) *Elapidæ*, to which the cobras belong, (2) the *Dendraspidæ*, (3) *Atractaspidæ*, of which two families only two species of each are at present known, and they are confined to South and West Africa, and (4) the *Hydrophidæ*, or poisonous sea snakes already mentioned; the viperine sub-order includes the two families of *Crotalidæ* or pit vipers, as the rattlesnakes, and the *Viperidæ*, as the common English adder, the puff adder, &c. America may be considered the head-quarters of the *Crotalidæ* or rattlesnakes; Africa of the *Viperidæ*; Australia of the *Elapidæ*; and the Indian Ocean of the *Hydrophidæ*. There are no rattlesnakes in Europe, Australia, and Africa; those which occur in Asia are smaller in size and less venomous than the American species; there are none of the *Viperidæ* in America; in Australia the death adder (*Acanthophis antarctica*) of the colonists is the sole representative of this family. As a rule, in all countries the non-venomous snakes are largely in excess of the venomous species, but in Australia there is more than double the number of the latter kind; Krefft enumerates twenty-one non-venomous and fifty-seven venomous species, viz. forty-one species of *Elapidæ*, one viper, and fifteen sea snakes. Perhaps the non-venomous species make up about four-fifths of the snake fauna of the entire world. Of the twenty-one non-venomous snakes of Australia six are pythons, while eight belong to the genus *Typhlops* (blind snakes), of a family which contains forms 'most remote from the true ophidian type,' and which were formerly classed with the lizards. However, of these forty-two venomous snakes of Australia, Krefft considers that not more than five species are really dangerous to man and the higher animals; and these retire under ground for nearly five months in the year. Writing in 1869 Krefft says that through exertions made the dangerous snakes of the neighbourhood of Sydney have been greatly reduced. When we consider the modified structure of the rattlesnakes, which departs furthest from the non-venomous kinds, as well as their geographical range, it seems probable that the American rattlesnakes have succeeded their Asiatic representatives, and

that, viewing the whole, the Ophidia have been preceded by the other orders of reptiles; the venomous snakes by non-venomous, viperine by venomous colubrine snakes, and the rattlesnakes or *Crotalidæ* by *Viperidæ*.

There are many questions relating to snake structure and snake habits which still await satisfactory explanation; one of the most interesting, perhaps, is that which relates to the rattlesnake's tail. Why does the reptile sound its rattle? The most recent popular English work on snakes is that by Miss Hopley, who, strangely enough for a lady, has paid a great deal of attention to these creatures, and seems to be rather fond of them on the whole; but though not fearing to handle many of the harmless colubrines and pythons, she would decidedly object to admit a viper to her bosom. The chapter which treats of the 'Rattle' seems to us to be remarkably good. Miss Hopley gives drawings of the interesting tail part, both as to size and development, and shows how the rattles differ in form in various species of snakes, and how the links differ in one and the same rattle, and gives instances of opinions expressed by different authors as to the reason of the rattle. One of the most popular but erroneous notions held with regard to this serpent's tail is that it was specially designed by the Creator in order to warn the inadvertent intruder of danger.

'Formerly, when only the dangerous powers of the reptile were understood, it was sufficient to say of it in a tone of pious thankfulness that the Almighty had so armed this serpent as a warning to its enemies. Some of these early writers introduce the rattlesnake to us as the most benevolent and disinterested of dumb animals, conscientiously living up to his duties, obedient to that "peculiar Providence" which has given him a rattle "to warn the inadvertent intruder of danger." "He maketh such a noise that he catcheth very few," an evidence of imprudence wholly inconsistent with his inherited "wisdom." Indeed, between the character given of this "superb reptile" by Chateaubriand, and the self-sacrificing qualities assigned it by some other writers, we can only wonder how a hungry rattlesnake ever managed to survive at all, and how it is that the race is not extinct long ago.'*

It is certainly surprising to find that no less an authority than Professor Rymer Jones recognises in the rattlesnake's tail an admirable provision of nature which serves to give timely warning of the vicinity of a dangerous assailant. 'We need 'merely mention,' writes Professor R. Jones, 'the rattle of the 'rattlesnakes (*Crotalus*); an organ the intention of which is

* Snakes, &c., p. 306.

‘ so obvious, that the most obtuse cannot contemplate it without at once appreciating the beauty of its contrivance.’* The late Charles Darwin, briefly commenting upon this method of accounting for the rattlesnake’s tail, says :—

‘ It is admitted that the rattlesnake has a poison fang for its own defence, and for the destruction of its prey ; but some authors suppose that at the same time it is furnished with a rattle for its own injury, namely, to warn its prey. I would almost as soon believe that the cat curls the end of its tail when preparing to spring, in order to warn the doomed mouse. It is a much more probable view that the rattlesnake uses its rattle, the cobra expands its frill, and the puff adder swells whilst hissing so loudly and harshly, in order to alarm the many birds and beasts which are known to attack even the most venomous species. Snakes act on the same principle which makes the hen ruffle her feathers and expand her wings when a dog approaches her chickens.’†

Professor Shaler believes that, as the sound of this snake’s rattle resembles that of some of the stridulating insects upon which certain birds feed, its use is to attract these to itself ; he himself had mistaken the rattle sound for that of a locust. Another American writer says that he has often mistaken the sound for that of a grasshopper, locust, or cicada. Miss Hopley, who resided some years in Virginia, speaks of the ‘ ceaseless chirps ‘ and whizzings of those ubiquitous insects which are furnished ‘ with the stridulating apparatus, and which lead you almost ‘ to expect to see a scissors-grinder behind every tree.’ Mr. A. R. Wallace, in a paper read before the Zoological Society in 1871, drew attention to the resemblance between the sound of this snake’s rattle and the singing of a cricket, and was of opinion that the rattle’s use is to decoy insectivorous animals. The editor of the ‘ American Naturalist ’ (vol. vi. 1872) thinks that rattlesnakes do not systematically sound their rattles when seeking prey ; and Miss Hopley adds that, so far as observation of snakes in confinement can be of use, the opinion above expressed may be confirmed. ‘ We do not find,’ she says, ‘ that the snake uses its rattle upon food being placed ‘ in its cage, unless the rat or the guinea-pig come tumbling ‘ unexpectedly or unceremoniously upon the snake, when it ‘ would sound its rattle in alarm ; but it waits quietly, silently, ‘ rather receding than advancing towards the destined prey, ‘ and then, after cautious observation, stealthily approaching ‘ to give the fatal bite.’ In answer to this objection it may be fairly said that a snake in confinement does not of necessity

* General Structure of the Animal Kingdom, p. 685.

† Origin of Species, sixth edition, p. 162.

behave like one at liberty in its own natural haunts ; moreover, when the snake already saw its dinner provided for it and within reach, there would be no necessity for it to sound its ‘ dinner bell.’

Perhaps Miss Hopley is correct in her own opinion that the *Crotalus* in common with other snakes, and like dogs and cats, expresses a variety of feelings with its sounding tail, fear being the most predominant one. ‘ That the sound has a language of its own is known by the fact that when [a snake is] disturbed and one rattle is springing all other rattlesnakes within hearing take up the chorus. That the sexes also understand each other through crotaline eloquence is generally believed.’ Miss Hopley mentions that a rattlesnake never hisses, and that the only possible way in which a snake can audibly express its emotions, whatever they may be, is by its rattling tail ; she believes, therefore, with good reason we think, that the rattle is a substitute for the voice, so far as hissing can be called a voice ; ‘ and that what would cause other excessively nervous, timid, terrified snakes to hiss, causes the rattle to vibrate. It may attract insectivorous birds ; it may alarm other timid creatures ; it may summon its mate ; . . . it may be to express anger, fear, and for aught we know pleasure, in a state of liberty and enjoyment, feelings expressed by the tail of other creatures.’ (Pp. 313, 314.)

Miss Hopley has spent many hours in watching the habits of various snakes in the reptile house of the Regent’s Park Zoological Gardens, and in consequence most of her observations are full of interest. There is at present in the reptile house a prettily marked python, which was born in the Gardens in June 1877 ; it is consequently still a young one ; in the adjoining compartment is another python of the same age, but not quite so large. These snakes are brothers or sisters ; at any rate they are the offspring of the same mother ; one, whose form suspended from a branch is depicted (on p. 201 of Miss Hopley’s book) in an attitude as if about to make a meal of some sparrows on the ground, is known by the name of Totsey. This snake is quite tame, never offers to bite or to show the least resistance, and we have ourselves had the creature in our arms ; but its brother or sister in the adjoining cage is what the keeper calls very ‘ spiteful,’ and he would never think of handling it. Equal in age and origin,

‘ Ambo florentes ætatibus, Arcades ambo,’

but by no means equal in disposition.

Roget rightly says of a python, that ‘ its whole body is a

‘hand.’ Miss Hopley illustrates this by a drawing and by description. The drawing on p. 205 represents (1) a snake with a couple of its anterior coils round a sparrow and with another sparrow held down by the extended tail; (2) with one bird held by the mouth, another by a double coil, and a third similarly held down; (3) the first bird half in the mouth, the second with a double medial coil, and the third bird with a double coil around it near the snake’s tail.

‘One of the most remarkable cases of what we may call independent constricting powers—that is, two or more parts of the reptile being engaged at the same time—was in some very hungry, or very greedy, or very sagacious little constrictors, “the four-rayed snakes,” *Elaphis quater-lineatus*. They are slender for their length, which may be from three to five feet, of an inconspicuous colour, but with two black lines on each side, running the whole length of their body; hence their name “four-lined” or “four-rayed.” In the present instance, there were in the cage three of these, also one young royal python, one small common boa, and one thick-necked tree boa (*Epicratis cenchris*), all constrictors. The day was close and warm for April, and the snakes, reviving from their winter torpor, seemed particularly active and lively. Probably they had not fed much of late, and thought now was their opportunity, for the keeper no sooner threw the birds—finding plenty of them for all—into the cage, than there was a general scuffle. Each of the six snakes seized its bird and entwined it; then on the part of the reptiles all was comparatively still. The rest of the poor little birds, fluttering hither and thither, were, however, not disregarded, for although each snake was constricting its captive, several of them captured another bird by pressing it beneath them, and holding it down with a disengaged part of themselves. One of the four-rayed snakes felt its held-down victim struggling, and instantaneously a second coil was thrown round it. Then another caught a second bird in its mouth, for its head and neck were not occupied with the bird already held, and, in order to have coils at its disposal, slipped down its first captive, or rather passed itself onwards to constrict the second, the earlier coils not changing in form in the slightest degree, any more than a ring passed down a cord would change its form. The next moment I saw one of those two hungry ones with three birds under its control. It had already begun to eat the first, a second was coiled about eight inches behind, and a good deal of the posterior portion of the reptile was still disengaged, when a bird passed across its tail, and instantly that was captured. All this was done by a sense of feeling only, as the snakes did not once turn their heads. Two of these “four-rayed” snakes were so close together, so rapid in their movements, so excited and eager for their prey, that which of them first began his bird, and which one caught the third, it is impossible to affirm confidently.’

All this seems very dreadful and cruel on the part of the snakes, no doubt, and likely to excite the anger of the Society

for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, which appears to have been the case about this time. 'After this date, April 1, 1881, nothing more was to be seen! Henceforth visitors were to be excluded, and the reptiles were to be fed after sunset.' We believe that the Zoological Society were threatened with legal proceedings unless they fed their snakes on dead birds, guinea-pigs, &c.; but as a snake will hardly ever eat dead food, that humane but ignorant suggestion could not be put into practice. In point of fact, however, we apprehend that the death of a constricted animal or of one bitten by a venomous snake is attended with, comparatively speaking, very little pain. Death is often rapid, and unconsciousness probably more rapid still. There are hundreds of cases in the world of nature which suggest to us the idea of cruelty to a far greater extent than really attaches to snakes; but perhaps the most wantonly cruel creature in existence is the domestic cat. 'Poor pussy' seems to be in ecstasies of delight as she tortures the little mouse she has caught, now tossing its panting body up into the air with both of her paws, now pushing it about and getting angry if the half-dead victim will not exhibit a few more faint indications of life to her delighted eyes.

'Venomous snakes,' says Krefft, 'bite and let go; pythons retain their hold. It is hard to disengage one's fingers from between the jaws of a rock snake, for if main force be used, the flesh will be torn to shreds, as all the teeth are curved backwards.' The venomous snake depends upon its poison for its food; it is, doubtless, conscious of its power, and knows well, when it lets go its hold, that it will soon regain it.

Miss Hopley has an interesting chapter on the question, 'Do snakes afford a refuge to their young?' 'Do vipers swallow their young in times of danger?' She gives the opinions of naturalists on this much-mooted point; the general evidence would seem to lead to an affirmatory conclusion, if reliance can be placed on the correctness of actual eye-witnesses of young snakes entering the mouth of the mother and of their being found in the stomach after she had been killed. That young snakes should temporarily take refuge in their mother's mouth, strange as the phenomenon may appear, is not more strange than what is known to take place in certain fishes, as in some species of *Arius*, one of the *Siluridæ*, the male of which carries the ova in his capacious pharynx, where they are developed; other fishes belonging to other families, as a species of *Chromis* found in the Sea of Galilee, are said to

take care of their ova in a similar manner. Speaking of a species of *Geophagus*, Agassiz writes:—

‘This fish has a most extraordinary mode of reproduction. The eggs pass, I know not how, into the mouth, the bottom of which is lined by them, between the inner appendages of the branchial arches, and especially into a pouch formed by the upper pharyngeals, which they completely fill. Then they are hatched, and the little ones, freed from the egg case, are developed until they are in a condition to provide for their own existence. I do not know how long this continues; but I have already met with specimens whose young had no longer any vitelline sac, but were still harboured by the progenitor.’*

The question has been well considered in America. In February 1873, Professor G. Browne Goode, of Connecticut, invited all the authentic information that could be procured on the question, ‘Do snakes swallow their young?’ He received as many as one hundred and twenty testimonies from as many persons in various parts of the United States that single season. The conclusion to which Professor Goode arrived is that the popular idea is sustained by facts:—

‘Of the hundred or more instances occurring in America and presented to the assembly, those considered of especial interest were published in the Reports of the Association; and after some further discussion, Professor Gill said that he considered the evidence sufficient to finally decide the matter. “Since many important facts in biology “are accepted on the statements of one single observer, these testimonies are claimed to be sufficient to set the matter for ever at rest.” This was the conclusion arrived at by the members of the American “Science Convention on Snakes” in 1873. Of the witnesses introduced on that occasion, Professor Goode dismissed those who had only *found* the young snakes within the parent, but had not *seen* them enter. “Let us not trust to untrained observations,” he said, those whose testimony was accepted being, in addition to the well-known men already mentioned, “an intelligent class of farmers, planters, and “business men, intelligent readers of an agricultural magazine.” . . . The well-attested cases included many non-venomous species, the habit probably extending to all those which are known as oviparous, as well as the *Crotalidæ*. The examples embraced the garter snake, *Eutania sirtalis* and *E. saurita*; the water snake, *Tropidonotus sipedon*; the rattlesnake, *Caudisona horridus*; the copper-head and moccasin, *Ancistrodon contortrix* and *piscivorus*; the “massasauga,” *Crotalus tergeminus*; the English viper, *Pelias berus*; and the mountain black snake, *Coluber Alleghaniensis*. Probably all the *Crotalidæ* might be included. It remains to be shown whether the habit extends to the egg-laying snakes, but as yet no proof had occurred.’ (Pp. 494, 495.)

A writer who signs his name James Simson, in a letter

* Journey in Brazil, p. 220 note.

(dated New York, March 21, 1883) to the editor of the 'Journal of Science' (May, 1883), goes so far as to say that all snakes when living in a state of nature swallow their young. He lays this down 'as an axiom till the opposite be proved of any particular species.' (!)

The question arises, however, how far the swallowing is an act not prompted by maternal love but by hunger or fear; this was the opinion of Dr. J. Davy, who reported on the young snakes seen by Mr. Norman's keeper to enter the old one's mouth and found in the inside, which together with their parent were submitted to that eminent physiologist (see the 'Natural History Review,' January and April 1862).

It is most necessary to be very cautious in these and similar natural history questions; scepticism, though doubtless sometimes carried too far, is after all a virtue. Still, the opinions of such scientific authorities as Professor Goode and Professor Gill undoubtedly tend to dissipate incredulity in this old snake story.

Less satisfactory, we think, is Miss Hopley's chapter 'On the Great Sea Serpent.' There is no trustworthy evidence as to the existence of any gigantic sea snake. The supposed creatures have always proved to be something quite different; or wilful hoaxes have served to supply, in newspaper columns, the love of the marvellous. That there may be creatures of some kind or other living in the sea of enormous size, of whose form we are at present ignorant, there is no *à priori* physiological reason to deny, but until we have clear proof of their existence we shall refuse to give any credit to the accounts. The story, as related by the crew of the 'Pauline,' on July 8, 1875, of a large sperm whale 'being gripped round the body with two turns of what appeared to be a huge serpent,' is a perfectly trustworthy narrative of something which was seen on that occasion. We believe ourselves that the creature seen was some species of enormous squid (*Cephalopod*) which had attached itself by two of its arms to the body of a sperm whale; these two arms at a distance might well resemble the coils of a serpent; that the supposed body of the snake raised high above the water was the locked pair of long tentacles, which these creatures are in the habit of raising above the water. The existence of gigantic cuttle-fishes is a veritable fact; the last Report of the United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries contains an interesting paper on 'the Cephalopods of the North-Eastern Coast of America.' *Architeuthis princeps* afforded a specimen of itself 20 feet long from beak to tail, and 35 feet in length of tentacles. The ends of

the two tentacles being locked together in most of their length would be free at the extremity, and resemble the open mouth of a snake. The presence of sperm whales and cephalopods together is natural, for the former feed on the latter; and the gigantic specimens of squid are known to be fierce and retaliative. However, be this as it may, a true snake cannot answer to the descriptions of the 'great sea serpent,' which supposed creature has been discovered to be a couple of sharks following each other, or a string of porpoises or long bunches of seaweed, &c. Serpents are air-breathers, and must, when active, come to the surface of the water continually to breathe; consequently, like the veritable sea snakes, or *Hydrophidæ*, they would be frequently seen, and the real nature of great sea serpents must have revealed itself long ere now did such creatures exist. Fishes may live long in the ocean's depths and escape observation for years, like the newly discovered *Eurypharynx pelecanoides*, taken off the coast of Morocco. Many fishes have no need to come to the surface at all, and therefore new forms are frequently found. Nor will it meet the case to say that, as reptiles hibernate or spend much of their lives in a state of periodic repose, great sea serpents, as recorded, are not improbable creatures. Land snakes pass their time of repose under ground or in concealment somewhere on land; sea snakes (*Hydrophidæ*) take their periodic rest on the top of the water, with their nostrils exposed to the air. According to the observations of Dr. Cantor, they seem so soundly asleep on the surface of the water, 'that a ship passing among them does not awaken them.' Perhaps some fortunate vessel may succeed in catching a great sea serpent asleep! Again, the recorded instances of great sea serpents are sometimes represented as possessing 'fins' or 'flappers' or other appendages. Moreover, it is extremely improbable that any such gigantic creatures should exist without leaving some part of their remains, as vertebræ, to be stranded on the shore somewhere or to be dredged up from the bottom. We think that the chapter on the great sea serpent, in which Miss Hopley seems rather inclined to believe, out of place in a book which professes to deal with ophidian realities. There are a few ambiguous expressions here and there to be found in this volume, and one or two mistakes in anatomy and zoology, but on the whole it is the best popular treatise on the subject of snakes and snake-life which exists. Though we do not anticipate the time when ladies will take to keep pet snakes as a natural history pastime, there is no doubt that much remains to be learned concerning these creatures by continual and close

observation. Snakes are certainly 'out-of-the-way pets;' but as an illustration of the knowledge to be gained by keeping them, we may mention the interesting fact, not generally known, that our common English snake (*Tropidonotus natrix*) occasionally incubates her eggs. Dr. Arthur Stradley, a gentleman who has resided in Brazil and paid much attention to serpent life, has given an interesting account of the common snake occasionally incubating, as witnessed by himself.*

Experience alone can teach us what kinds of animals, even of low organisation, are capable of being tamed, and he would be a rash man who denied to the humblest the possession of all intelligence. Sir John Lubbock tames wasps and ants; Dr. Stradling kept a partially tamed spider that would take a beetle from his fingers; and even a story is told of a sailor who possessed a tame cockroach which knew his voice and fed out of his hand, and lived in a little cardboard model of Windsor Castle for seven years! As to tame snakes, Dr. Stradling says that 'there is no charming or music or mystery about the matter; snakes are tamed on precisely the same principles as other animals.' In time they will become in a great measure 'habituated to your presence, and begin to know that you do not mean to hurt them, and when the latter idea is permanently instilled into them they will be tame. It is this, an implicit trust, that constitutes tameness, far more than the expectation of reward, and the two great agents in effecting it are constant handling and talking to them. . . . Talk to them always. . . . It may seem queer to read about talking to a snake, but I do not know that the notion is more absurd than that of talking to a baby.'

But among snakes there are many venomous kinds, and their deservedly evil reputation is enough to occasion in most minds a feeling of abhorrence for the whole tribe. Conspicuous amongst the venomous kinds are some which cause thousands of deaths among human beings in India every year. India is richer in snakes than any other country in the world; about one hundred and fifty species inhabiting the Indian peninsula have been described, and of these twenty-five are poisonous, but in this estimate the sea snakes or *Hydrophidæ* are included. Of the *Viperidæ* there are only two Indian species. The other venomous snakes are nearly equally divided between the two families, the *Crotalidæ*, chiefly belonging to the genus *Trimeresurus*, and the *Elapidæ*. Sir Joseph Fayrer, whose large and splendid work is the

* See 'Boy's Own Paper,' Dec. 1882, p. 107.

highest authority on all that relates to the poisonous snakes of India, considers, from the statistics he has been able to obtain, that in order of destructiveness the cobra (*Naja tripudians*), in its several varieties, 'occupies the first place on the list; the 'krait (*Bungarus cæruleus*) occupies the second place; whilst 'under the headings of "other snakes and unknown" must 'be included many deaths due to the cobra, *Bungarus cæruleus*, 'hamadryad, *Daboia*, *Bungarus fasciatus*, *Ilydorphidæ*, and 'some perhaps to *Echis carinata* and the *Trimeresuri*; though 'as to the last there is reason to believe that deaths from their 'bites are comparatively very rare.' Sir Joseph Fayrer made a great number of experiments on the influence of snake poison on various animals, and he arrived at the following interesting conclusions amongst others:—1. After death by a colubrine snake the blood generally coagulates on removal from the body; and after death by viperine poison the blood remains fluid. 2. Cats resist the influence of poison almost as long as dogs three or four times their size. 3. The poisonous snakes are not affected by their own poison; a cobra may be made to bite itself or another cobra without any effect. 4. Snake poison may be absorbed and fatal in its action when applied to a mucous or serous membrane, to the stomach or the conjunctiva. 5. Bodies of snakes are eaten with impunity by man and animals. 6. The blood of an animal killed by snake poison is itself poisonous.

It appears that the milk of a woman bitten by a poisonous snake has power to poison her infant. We subjoin the account of Mr. Shirecore to Sir J. Fayrer:—

'Case of snake poisoning in which the mother died, and her infant, who was at the breast after the mother was bitten, died also from the poison.—On July 16, 1871, a woman named Gurra Dasse, residing in the village of Rughoohath, near Dum-Dum, in the district of twenty-four Pergunnahs, was aroused from a sound sleep at about 1 A.M. by a smarting sensation in the forefinger of her right hand, and thought that something had bitten her. She had at the time her infant—seven months old—by her side; and her husband, with her other children, was sleeping in the same room a little distance from her. She called out to her husband and told him what had happened, but feeling very drowsy, and receiving no answer from her husband, who is excessively deaf, she fell into a slumber, and while in that state allowed her infant to take her breast. Soon after this she began to experience a painful sensation along her right arm, and a general restlessness of the whole body, and at the same time she observed that her child had likewise become very restless and was foaming at the mouth. Alarmed at this, she got up and called her neighbours, who came immediately to her assistance. Nothing, however, was done in the way of treatment

beyond repeating "muntros" (chanting charms) to expel the poison from the body, which is the usual mode of treating cases of snake-bite in India. The consequence was that both mother and child became rapidly worse and died; the mother about four hours after she was bitten, and the child about two hours after she had taken the mother's breast. The snake was not seen by any one, and no attempt was made by a search inside the room to ascertain what kind of snake had bitten the woman. Both the bodies were sent to me by the police, and were examined on the morning of July 17. The face in both cases was livid and swollen, and there was an issue of bloody froth from the mouth and nostrils. In the forefinger of the right hand of the mother was a distinct mark of a snake-bite. The finger and the hand were considerably swollen with discoloration of the soft parts. This was very marked in the finger, which when dissected appeared as though it had been severely bruised. The blood was quite fluid in both cases, and the organs were all more or less congested. The body of the child was carefully inspected, but not the slightest trace of a bite or any kind of injury could be detected in any part of it. The conclusion drawn from the above fact is, that the mother died from the effects of the snake-bite, and the child was poisoned through her milk.*

Sir Joseph Fayrer considers the hamadryad (*Ophiophagus elaps*), the snake-eating snake, of which a specimen has been for some years a resident in the reptile house of the Regent's Park Gardens, probably the largest and most venomous snake known; but fortunately it is not very common. This snake feeds entirely upon other snakes when it is able to take them; the specimen in the Zoological Gardens, we believe, refuses all food unless presented to it in the shape of another snake; we have witnessed this creature in the act of feeding upon a common ring snake, the anterior part of whose body was engulfed within the jaws and œsophagus of the hamadryad, and whose posterior portion was vainly endeavouring to aid liberation by twisting round a branch of the tree inside its cage. This snake is very fierce, and 'is always ready not only to attack but to pursue when opposed.' A story is told of a Burman who disturbed a nest of these serpents and immediately retreated, the old female giving chase; the man reached a small river, into which he plunged, hoping he had escaped his fiery enemy—

'but lo! on reaching the opposite bank up reared the furious hamadryad, its dilated eyes glistening with rage, ready to bury its fangs in his trembling body. In utter despair he bethought himself of his turban, and in a moment dashed it upon the serpent, which darted upon it like lightning, and for some moments wreaked its vengeance in furious bites; after which it returned quietly to its former haunts.' †

* *Thanatophidia*, p. 43.

† *Ibid.* p. 9.

The 'Krait' (*Bungarus cæruleus*) is considered to be next to the cobra the most destructive snake to human life in India, though not actually so venomous as some others; the fangs are rather short, and excision is more practicable, recoveries more numerous. Kraits are found in the open country, in grass and low jungle and in fields, and sometimes find their way into houses and huts. This species is not usually aggressive, and like most snakes tries to escape when discovered, 'but if attacked' it retaliates fiercely, and its bite is very dangerous.' The *B. cæruleus* is prettily marked with purple and white, and the drawing of this species would not lead us to believe that it was one of the most dangerous snakes.

The Tic-polonga (*Daboia Russellii*) is a very beautifully marked snake of a light chocolate colour, with three series of large black, white-edged rings, those of the middle series ovate, those of the outer circular. In Ceylon, where it is known as the Tic-polonga, it is justly dreaded as a very deadly snake. Dr. Russell and Sir J. Fayerer consider it nearly as deadly as the cobra.

'Fowls bitten by the snake expired in from thirty-five seconds to several minutes; dogs in from seven minutes to several hours; a cat in fifty-seven minutes; a horse in eleven and a half hours. Death was not in any case so rapid as after the cobra bite; but though slower in action, the poison seemed just as deadly. The blood remains fluid after death from the poison of the *daboia*, whereas after cobra poisoning it coagulates firmly on being removed from the heart and great vessels. The *daboia* is nocturnal in habits; in confinement it is sluggish, and does not readily strike unless roused and irritated, when it bites with great force and determination. When disturbed it hisses fiercely, and when it strikes does so with great vigour. Its long movable fangs are very prominent objects, and with them it is capable of inflicting a very deep as well as poisoned wound. . . . In the official returns of deaths from snake-bites a large number are attributed to snakes unknown. If the real offender could be detected, it is probable that the *daboia* would have a more prominent place than it occupies at present.'

The only other viper known in India besides the *daboia* is the *Echis carinata*, known to the natives of Delhi as the 'Afie'; it is the Horatta Pam of Russell's work on Serpents, and appears to come the fourth in order as a cause of death. The echis is a small viper seldom exceeding two feet in length. Sir J. Fayerer says it is fierce and aggressive—always on the defensive and ready to attack:—

'It throws itself into a double coil, the folds of which are in perpetual motion, and as they rub against each other, they make a loud rustling noise very like hissing. This sound is produced by the three or four

outer rows of carinated scales, which are very prominent and point downwards at a different angle to the rest; their friction against each other causes the sound. This little viper does not, I think, hiss at all. Its fangs are very long and mobile, like those of *daboia*. Its eye has a peculiarly vicious appearance.'

Dr. Günther, however, states that the bite of the *Echis carinata* is not known to have proved fatal; but Sir J. Fayrer mentions that one in his possession killed a fowl in four minutes, another in two minutes, and a dog in about four hours. Of the family of *Crotalidæ*, or pit vipers, there are several kinds in British India. They are called pit vipers because there is a large pit or depression on each side of the face between the eye and the nostril. About two-thirds of the Indian *Crotalidæ* belong to the genus *Trimeresurus*; the general colour is grass green or brown, in harmony with their arboreal life. These snakes have a decidedly viperiform look about them; the head is broad and triangular, the neck narrow, and the body robust. The fangs of the *Trimeresuri* are long and capable of inflicting a deep puncture; they are fierce and venomous, but very few deaths are ascribed to their bites, showing a striking contrast to the *Crotalidæ* or rattlesnakes of America in this respect. It is the opinion of those who have experimented on the poison of the *Trimeresuri*, that its effects are less dangerous than those of other venomous snakes. 'The symptoms are severe pain and swelling of the bitten part or of the whole limb, with nausea, sickness, depression, fever, and then sloughing of the bitten part, after which recovery is rapid. In weak or sickly individuals fatal results might occur, but such cases are exceptional.' One of the genera of the pit vipers, namely *Halys*, has a long spinous scale at the end of the tail, evidently a rudiment of the 'rattle,' well developed in the American *Crotalidæ*.

Sir Joseph Fayrer has little faith in any of the so-called antidotes to snake poison :—

'To name all these supposed antidotes would be impossible; but I may say that most reliance has been placed on a few, such as ammonia, arsenic, iodine, bromine, the poison and the bite of other snakes, the guaco plant, ipecacuanha, aristolochia, senega. Indeed, nearly every drug in or out of the Pharmacopœia has been recommended; to say nothing of many other things that have been in vogue among the ignorant, vulgar, or superstitious, and that have nothing whatever but credulity to suggest their utility. I have made repeated experiments with many of them on the lower animals, and have seen nothing to induce me to believe that they have any good effect whatever. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe them to be useless, and

that, excepting for their stimulant action, when they have any, they are inert.*

The death-rate among the natives of India is certainly very fearful; the deaths may be set down with tolerable certainty to these three pre-eminently venomous species which are more common than some of the other kinds, viz. the *Cobra*, the *Daboia* and the 'Krait' (*Bungarus cæruleus*). Doubtless other snakes may claim a share in the deaths caused to human beings, but the share is a small one. In 1869 the deaths from snake-bites in the Bengal Presidency amounted to 6,219 as recorded; unrecorded cases may be supposed to have occurred. Of these 959 were ascribed to the cobra, 160 to the krait, and 4,752 to 'snakes unknown,' because the snakes are not often seen after they have bitten. There was an excess of 145 females over the males; adult females suffering most. In British Burmah, out of 120 deaths recorded during the same year, 45 were ascribed to the cobra, and nearly all the rest to the daboia. Sir Joseph Fayrer is probably within the mark when he concludes that were returns made from the whole of Hindostan, it would be found that more than 20,000 inhabitants of British India meet their deaths annually from snake-bite alone. And what can be done to diminish the death-rate from a cause so terrible? The first obvious answer would be, to diminish the number of snakes by waging war against them. But this is easier said than done in such a country as India. As to the advisability of offering a Government reward for the capture of living poisonous snakes, there seems to be great difference of opinion. Sir J. Fayrer is in favour of money rewards.

'I cannot help thinking,' he says, 'that if local governments made it part of the duty of district officers not merely to proclaim these rewards, but to encourage the destruction of wild animals and snakes, by the operation of an organised establishment, with which they should be supplied in these districts, much benefit would result. The money rewards already offered would probably suffice for wild animals, but those for venomous snakes should be increased; and if the people were encouraged to work for them and were aided by persons acting under properly selected superiors, the result would soon be a diminution of the wild animals and snakes.'

The most recent opinion on the question of the extermination of venomous serpents is that expressed by Dr. Arthur Stradling in 'The Scientific American' of April 14, 1883. His remarks are well worthy of consideration.

* Thanatophidia, pp. 38, 39.

‘The appalling destruction of life by snake-bite in India has for many years caused the minds of learned and inquiring men to be exercised in quest of some remedy which shall effectively cope with so terrible an evil. That these efforts have hitherto been directed rather towards discovering an antidote for the venom than to what is proverbially better than cure, viz. prevention, or, in other words, the extermination of the reptiles themselves, is not to be wondered at, when collateral circumstances are taken into account—the exuberance of vegetation and smaller forms of animal life which afford the creatures shelter and sustenance, even in the immediate vicinity of human habitations, the intense susceptibility of the natives both to the accident of the bite and its fatality from various causes, their religious prejudices, which at the outset greatly hamper the success of Government rewards for the slaughter of certain species as proposed by Sir Joseph Fayrer, and the fact that the multiplicity of venoms as well as species has only recently been recognised. The dense population, tolerance if not encouragement of the cobra, the habit of walking barefoot and consequent liability to be bitten on the ankle (the most dangerous situation in the body, owing to the large size and superficial position of the veins in that region), the low *physique* and apathy of the Hindoo which cause him to lie down and die or trust to charms, instead of resorting to prompt and vigorous measures—all these and many other conditions contribute their influence in keeping up the enormous death-rate in India.’

Dr. Stradling thinks that a pitfall of some sort would be the best means for diminishing the number of snakes in a district. The pitfall might be in the form of a cistern sunk below the level of the ground, and furnished with water, frogs, and a cage of rats, or ‘some such small deer,’ as baits. Certainly the reward-system cannot be recommended if it be true that the mild Hindoo, alive to the desirability of reaping the proffered annas, ‘hatches all the snakes’ eggs he can find by ‘artificial heat in earthen pots, feeding the young ones until ‘they are big enough to earn the tariff reward.’

Dr. Stradling’s suggestions that snake-eating animals, such as the Mongoose, should be encouraged with a view to aid in keeping down the venomous reptiles, are certainly well worthy of consideration. We should much like to know how far, on the other hand, certain animals, as the Rodentia, are destructive to cultivated land or to young trees in British India, and how far the snakes keep the destructive pests of this nature in check. We seem to want definite information on these two points. There is scarcely an animal, perhaps, which does not combine in its operations both useful and injurious qualities; that animal is most useful whose agency for good far outbalances its agency for injury, either directly to man or to products serviceable to man. If the good effected is far in excess of the evil, then

the animal is a friend and should be protected; if the converse is true, the animal is a foe and must be treated as such. We know by experience in our own country that vast tracts of cultivated land and extensive plantations of young trees are not infrequently disastrously damaged by the field vole (*Arvicola agrestis*) and the long-tailed field mouse (*Mus sylvaticus*); owls, hawks, and other predaceous birds, if unmolested, and not, as is too often the case, foolishly destroyed by gamekeepers, help to keep these destructive little mammalian pests in check, and should be encouraged in certain localities at all events. How far India suffers from such pests, and how far snakes are beneficial in diminishing their numbers, are questions on which it seems to us it is desirable to obtain information if it be possible to do so. A complete and indiscriminate extermination of snakes from a given district might possibly result in the creation of a greater evil than the snakes themselves.

ART. VIII.—1. *A Genealogical and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage of the British Empire.* By Sir BERNARD BURKE, C.B., LL.D., Ulster King of Arms. 45th Edition. London: 1883.

2. *The Peerage, Baronetage, and Knightage of the British Empire.* By JOSEPH FOSTER. Fourth Edition. Two vols. Westminster: 1883.

IF the old heralds sometimes went a shade too far in their glorification of 'blood,' the tendency of these later times seems to be to ignore, or at least to undervalue, the sentiment of birth, and to substitute the worship of Mammon. Without going the length of saying that three generations are, in every instance, required to make a gentleman, perhaps the theory is, in most cases, nearer the truth than many moderns are disposed to acknowledge. In the present day, the 'self-made man' is persistently held up for our admiration; and the principle of 'a fair field and no favour' can scarcely be said to be impartially acted upon in certain quarters, where the circumstance of a man having been born a gentleman is actually regarded as a disadvantage!

' 'Tis not the world you knew, granny; its fetters have fallen off;
The lowliest now may rise and rule where the proud used to sit and scoff.

No need to boast of a scutcheoned stock, claim rights from an ancient wrong ;

All are born with a silver spoon in their mouths whose gums are sound and strong.'

So, at least, we have lately been informed by a living poet. It cannot be denied that, to a large extent, the plutocracy have assumed the place formerly occupied by the aristocracy of birth ; but whether the change is, in all respects, beneficial to the public weal is more than doubtful. In former times, the fair and honourable ambition of emulating the virtues of his ancestors was regarded as a very wholesome incentive to the well-born youth ; but the old-fashioned ' prejudice ' in favour of men of family is pronounced by the school of modern philosophers to be a snare and a delusion. A thoughtful and eloquent writer—the late Rev. F. W. Robertson, of Brighton—makes some striking remarks on the usual results of the change in question, in his interesting lecture on Wordsworth.

' There are chiefly,' he says, ' three influences counteractive of that great danger, accumulated wealth. The first is religion, the second is *hereditary rank*, and the third is the influence of men of contemplative lives. The first is religion, of which, as belonging to another place, for the sake of reverence, I will not speak here. The second counter-acting influence to accumulated wealth is hereditary rank. It is not generally the fashion in the present day to speak highly of rank, much less before the members of an Athenæum or of a working man's institute ; it is the fashion rather to speak of our common humanity, and to deprecate rank ; and good and right it is that common humanity should be dignified and elevated far above the distinction of convention and all the arbitrary and artificial differences of class ; and yet, after all this, in an age when it is certainly not the fashion to speak well of hereditary rank, it is well for us all to remember the advantages that have accrued to us in the past from that hereditary rank. I will say that rank is a power in itself more spiritual, because less tangible, than the power of wealth. The man who commands others by the extent of his broad acres, or by the number of his bales of cotton, rules them by a power more degrading and more earthly than he who rules them simply by the *prestige* of long hereditary claims. . . . And therefore it is that, with feelings strong on the side of human progress and with but little reverence for mushroom rank, I am yet free to acknowledge that I feel sometimes a pang when I hear or read of the extinction of great names, grey with the hoar of innumerable ages—sorrow when I read, in paper after paper, of the passing of great ancestral estates under the hammer of the auctioneer ; and for this reason, that in every such case I feel that there is one more sword gone that would have helped us in the battle which we must all fight against the superstitious idolatry of wealth.'

We take the same view of the challenge of the old régime

for social pre-eminence by the modern aristocracy of wealth. In some respects, the rivalry which this engenders is attended with very good results. If culture and manners exhibit palpable symptoms of deterioration in the conflict, and if, in many instances, the influences of 'the City' do not prove a very pleasing substitute for the tone and polish usually associated with old acres and historic names; on the other hand, the infusion of new blood is of no small practical importance. Many an extinct old stock might have been perpetuated, if its blue blood had been occasionally enriched with the calipash of the alderman, or renewed by a golden graft from the acquisitions of the prosperous merchant. Towards the end of last century, a humorous Scottish nobleman remarked, with reference to the intended marriage of one of his daughters to a successful 'man of the people,' that 'bluid and suet mak the best 'puddin';' and the same belief seems to have inspired the following lines of George Eliot, in one of her least known poems:—

'For still your traders like a mixture fair
Of blood that hurries to some higher strain
Than reckoning money's loss and money's gain.
And of such mixture, good may surely come:
Lords' scions so may learn to cast a sum,
A trader's grandson bear a well-set head,
And have less conscious manners, better bred;
Nor when he tries to be polite, be rude instead.'

A good many hard things have been said, in recent times, about the pretensions of the herald and the genealogist. The avocation of the latter has been described as 'the science of fools 'with long memories;' and even before the appearance of Matthew Prior's well-known epitaph, the claims of ancient lineage had been unscrupulously derided in a Scottish church-yard—

'Johnnie Carnegie lais heer,
Descendit of Adam and Eve;
Gif ony con gang hieher,
Ise willing give him leve.'

A Russian nobleman, who assumed the *rôle* of humility, on being interrogated by the Czar respecting the antiquity of his descent, replied that, like everybody else, he was sprung from one of Noah's three sons. Not so, however, the eccentric Laird of Macnab, who boldly repudiated any such miserable limitation. When asked how he contrived to get over the little difficulty of the Flood, he coolly explained that *his* ancestor possessed 'a coble o' his ain;' and to this day, the

proud Highlander's descendants carry an open boat in the base of their escutcheon. A radical Scottish lawyer, recently gone to his rest, once contemptuously said to a professional brother who did not sympathise with his opinions, 'What, pray, is the difference between a peer and a peasant—are not both made from the same clay?' 'True,' his friend responded, 'but the one is probably china, and the other common ware.' A somewhat similar opinion appears to have been entertained by the author of the 'Faerie Queen'—'the brightest jewel in the Spenser coronet'—who thus commences one of his celebrated cantos:—

' In brave poursuitt of honourable deed,
There is I know not what great difference
Betweene the vulgar and the noble seed,
Which unto things of valorous pretence,
Seemes to be borne by native influence.'

A propos to that sentiment, however, every genuine genealogist is well aware that some of the best blood in this kingdom flows in the veins of persons in very humble life. In his 'Reminiscences of the Oxford Movement,' speaking of Henry Ellacombe's addiction to genealogies and the universality of his sympathy, Mr. Mozley informs us that 'heraldry is no trifle in Devonshire, where a single name and coat may ramify into some dozen differences. At least a dozen of my labourers could have shown good coats of arms.' In like manner, the late John Riddell, the celebrated genealogist, bears testimony to the fact of many ordinary shopkeepers and tradesmen having been able to establish their descent from ancient and noble families. Not many years ago, the undoubted heir of line of an illustrious Scottish house—held by the same high authority to possess the 'reddest' blood in North Britain—occupied the humble position of a milliner in Cheapside. It was formerly the custom in Brittany for members of noble families when they went into trade to renounce, for a time, their hereditary armorial ensigns, and to resume them when they retired from a successful business. Such procedure was probably suggested by the views of the old heralds, who regarded the right to carry arms as quite incompatible with the prosecution of 'viles et mechanicas artes.' Hence the use of what were termed 'merchants' marks,' referred to by Sir George Mackenzie and other writers on the noble science of heraldry. We are not aware that the Breton practice was ever followed in our own country; and it is to be presumed that when the son of a duke, in the present day, does not hesitate to devote

himself to commercial pursuits, he considers it quite unnecessary to abandon the use of his family scutcheon.

Not seldom the tendency of self-made men is rather to glorify their humble origin, in accordance with the conduct of the French archbishop, who made a point of always keeping a rude wheel in his study, to remind him that he was the son of a carter. An interesting story is told of a prosperous Scottish shipbuilder entertaining, at his hospitable board, a mixed company which embraced distinguished representatives of the aristocracies of birth, wealth, and culture. An old gentleman, who happened to be present, alluded to the circumstance of the party being assembled on the fortieth anniversary of his wedding. His host politely corrected him, alleging that the previous day was the actual anniversary, and confirming his opinion by a series of questions. ‘You may remember,’ he said, ‘that after your marriage you left Glasgow in a chariot and four, by the road leading to —, and about a mile beyond the boundaries of the city, after passing through a toll-bar, one of your leaders cast a shoe. Fortunately a smith’s shop (*Scotticè* smiddy) was close at hand, and a youthful Vulcan came to the rescue, put on a fresh shoe, and you gave him half-a-crown.’ ‘Possibly you may be right,’ the old gentleman replied, ‘but I have forgotten the incident.’ ‘Not so I,’ rejoined the honest shipbuilder, ‘for I was the young blacksmith!’ Unhappily the memory of such traditions is not usually cherished by the second generation.

The sarcastic sayings of Voltaires and Chesterfields respecting the ‘accident’ of birth have been repeatedly and conclusively answered by very competent authorities, of whom it is sufficient to mention Edmund Gibbon and Sir Walter Scott. The historian of the Roman Empire remarks that ‘our calmer judgment will rather tend to moderate than to suppress the pride of an ancient and worthy race. The satirist may laugh, the philosopher may preach; but Reason herself will respect the prejudices and habits which have been consecrated by the experience of mankind.’ It must, however, be acknowledged that there is a considerable amount of truth in Sir Egerton Brydges’ remarks upon the topic in question. In his ‘Autobiography,’ he says that ‘there is no subject more difficult to be dwelt on than that of honourable descent; none on which the world are greater sceptics, none more offensive to them; and yet there is no quality to which every one in his heart pays so great a respect.’ It was a happy saying of Sir Thomas Overbury that the man who was

perpetually boasting of his pedigree was like a potato, of which the best part was underground; and both Shakspeare and Ben Jonson speak very sensibly on the same subject:—

‘Honours best thrive,
When rather from our acts we them derive
Than our fore-goers.’

‘Nor stand so much on your gentility,
Which is an airy and mere borrowed thing
From dead men’s dust and bones, and none of yours
Except you make and hold it.’

Finally, on this point, we cannot do better than quote the eloquent words of the lamented Earl of Crawford, in the introductory letter, addressed to two of his nearest kinsfolk, which is prefixed to his charming ‘Lives of the Lindsays:’—

‘Be grateful, then, for your descent from religious, as well as from noble ancestors; it is your duty to be so, and this is the only worthy tribute you can now pay to their ashes. Yet, at the same time, be most jealously on your guard lest this lawful satisfaction derogate into arrogance, or a fancied superiority over those nobles of God’s creation, who, endowed in other respects with every exalted quality, cannot point to a long line of ancestry. Pride is of all sins the most hateful in the sight of God, and, of the proud, who is so mean, who so despicable as he that values himself on the merits of others? And were they all so meritorious, these boasted ancestors? Were they all Christians? Remember, remember—if some of them have deserved praise, others have equally merited censure—if there have been “stainless knights,” never yet was there a stainless family since Adam’s fall. “Where, then, is boasting?”—for we would not, I hope, glory in iniquity.

“Only the actions of the just
Smell sweet and blossom in the dust.”’

A reverence for ancestry has been felt and acknowledged by many distinguished men remarkable for their simplicity of character, and an entire exemption from vanity or ostentation. Even in this money-loving age, the contempt of scutcheons is not quite so universal as some persons are disposed to believe; and the *practice* of our American cousins is by no means consistent with their professed belief in equality and democracy. One of the most curious proofs of our allegation is to be found in the not unfrequent fabrication of a fictitious ancestry on behalf of wealthy upstarts, which naturally reminds us of La Rochefoucauld’s happy definition of hypocrisy,—‘the homage which vice pays to virtue.’ The heralds of the Middle Ages were sometimes inclined to carry back their pedigrees to a very remote period, and to invent a good many ‘forebears’ for the earliest ancestor on record. Upwards of

two hundred years ago, we find Butler putting the following words into the mouth of his valiant hero:—

‘ ’Tis not Antiquity nor Author
That makes truth truth, altho’ time’s daughter ;
Nor does it follow, cause a Herald
Can make a gentleman, scarce a year old,
To be descended of a race
Of ancient kings in a small space,
That we should all opinion hold
Authentick that we can make old.’

The modern professors of the science of genealogy are still bolder in their procedure ; and such is the persuasive power of wealth, that, in the course of a single week, they contrive to furnish the obscurest *novus homo* with an historic name, an elaborate pedigree, and a highly respectable gallery of family portraits ! As to change of surname, we are all familiar with the unscrupulous transformation of Joshua Bug into Norfolk Howard, to say nothing of the less barefaced conversion of such names as Muggins, Bullock, Cuddy, and Taylor, into De Mogyn, Belcombe, Cuthbert, and Tayleure, a process which has been unfortunately encouraged by numerous legal decisions regarding the assumption of surnames on both sides of the Tweed. In this important matter we venture to think that the British Legislature might advantageously borrow a leaf from the statute-book of our French neighbours.

The exclusive appropriation of the term ‘nobility’ to the peerage is quite contrary to the theory of all sound heralds, and has only found acceptance in comparatively recent times. The correct view of the matter is undoubtedly this, that every British gentleman is *noble* who has a right to use armorial bearings, whether titled or not. ‘Nobiles sunt,’ says Sir Edward Coke, ‘qui arma gentilitia antecessorum suorum proferre possunt.’ In the fifteenth chapter of his ‘Constitutional History of England,’ Professor Stubbs makes some very instructive remarks on the character of English as contrasted with Continental nobility, pronouncing the former to be merely the nobility of hereditary counsellors of the Crown, the right to that position being at one time involved in the tenure of land, at another in the fact of summons, at another in the terms of a patent—the result rather than the cause of peerage. ‘The English law,’ he adds, ‘recognises simply the right of peerage, not the privilege of nobility as properly understood ; it recognises office, dignity, estate, and class, but not caste. . . . Social opinions and the rules of heraldry, which had perhaps their chief use in determining an international standard of

‘blood, alone recognise the distinction.’ Many of the oldest families in each of the three divisions of the United Kingdom have never reached the dignity of the peerage; while, on the other hand, not a few modern noblemen have very little to boast of in the shape of lineage. A glance at Mr. Shirley’s *libro d’oro*, ‘The Noble and Gentle Men of England,’ and at any recent Peerage, will corroborate our assertion. The former work, a small quarto of little more than 300 pages, contains a brief notice of all the English families existing in the male line, which were regularly established either as *knightly* or *gentle* houses before the commencement of the sixteenth century. Of the 329 families which the volume embraces, only 85 are represented by peers, 87 by baronets, and 157 by untitled squires. With regard to the British Peerage, as the late Mr. Hannay observes in one of his admirable essays, it is somewhat remarkable, ‘as illustrative of the mutability of fortune, that there is not a male descendant of one of the twenty-five English barons appointed to enforce the observance of Magna Charta, early in the thirteenth century, and that only two of the names (Percy and De Ros) occur in the present Upper House.’ Besides these two, however, who are both through females, there are several other descendants, also through females, including Lord Hereford, the Howards, and Lord Saye and Sele. Excluding the Bishops and the Scottish and Irish representative peers (amounting in all to 68), the present House of Lords consists of 451 members, only ten of whom—all holding baronies—date prior to the year 1400, the earliest being De Ros (1264). The surviving peerages of the fifteenth century amount to only seven; and of the two following centuries, to thirteen and thirty-four respectively. Accordingly, while only sixty-two date prior to 1700, no fewer than 389 have been created since that year.* During the thirty-eight years ending 1868, about 160 new patents of peerage were issued by seven different Administrations, the whole of which, however, were not absolute additions to the strength of the Upper Chamber. In the majority of instances, the dukes have been recruited from the ranks of the marquises, the marquises from the earls, the earls from the viscounts, and the viscounts from the barons.

The origin of our modern nobility would form an interesting subject for analysis. Thus, twenty existing peerages had their

* Of the seven existing peeresses of the realm in their own right, no fewer than four hold peerages created prior to 1600, the earliest being Le Despencer (1264).

rise in naval, and twenty-four in military heroes, one of each having been contributed by the late Egyptian war. The law has long been a prolific source of hereditary legislators, upwards of thirty of the present peerages having been originally conferred upon distinguished members of the long robe, of whom two were ennobled during the past year. Trade, too, has been rewarded with a fair quota of coronets. The earldom of Essex was founded by a draper, and that of Craven by a merchant tailor. The present Earl of Warwick is descended not from Richard Neville, the celebrated 'kingmaker,' but from William Greville, an honest woolstapler. It should, however, be borne in mind that, in the case of a good many peerages spring from commerce, the founder was a younger son of a family of gentle birth.

The earliest approach to a 'Peerage' in the bibliographical sense of that term appears to have been published in 1610, the compiler being Thomas Milles of Davington Hall, Kent, nephew of Robert Glover, Somerset Herald in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to whose industry he was indebted for most of his materials. The book was founded upon the model of the great French work of Claude Paradin, published in 1561, and Milles occupied no less than eighteen years in rendering the volume fit for the public eye. In the epistle dedicatory to the Earls of Salisbury and Northampton, he informs the reader that 'this work, entending nothing but honor unto all, disputes no titles, publique nor private, but aymes at *truth* onely in matter of descents, genealogies, armes, and pedegrees.*' Milles' work was followed in 1619 and 1622 by the first and second editions of the 'Catalogue and Succession of the Kings, Princes, Dukes, Marquesses, Earles, and Viscounts of this Realme of England,' by Ralph Brooke, York Herald, in which he professes to have discovered 'many errors committed by men of other professions, and lately published in print, to the great wronging of the

* It extends to 1,130 pages folio, the full title being as follows:—
 'The Catalogue of Honor, or Treasury of true Nobility peculiar and proper to the Isle of Great Britaine; that is to say, a Collection Historieall of all the free Monarches as well Kinges of England as Scotlande (nowe united together), with the Princes of Walles, Dukes, Marquisses, and Erles; their wives, children, alliances, families, descentes, and achievements of Honor. Whereunto is properly prefixed, a speciall Treatise of that kind of Nobility which Soverayne Grace and favor and Contryes Customes have made meerly Politicall, and peculiarly Civill (never distinctly handled before). By Thomas Milles. Translated out of Latyne into English. London: printed by William Jaggard, 1610.'

‘Nobility, and prejudice of His Maiestic’s Officers of Armes.’ In a long poetical address ‘To Posteritie,’ the author states that :—

‘Fvll fiftie winters are now spent, since I
First learn’d the elements of Herauldrie,
Twice twentie also are expired since
I first was sworne a seruant to my Prince ;
And with much paine, expence of time and cost,
Many heapes of worne Records haue turn’d and tost.’

Brooke’s work has been generally regarded as one of real value, from the circumstance of his ready access to those official records which impart the greatest validity to genealogical statements. It was, nevertheless, speedily impugned by Augustine Vincent, Rouge-Croix Pursuivant of Arms, a protégé of Camden’s, whose own ‘*Britannia*’ had been severely criticised by Brooke a few years after its publication in 1594. The mutual charges of ignorance and inaccuracy brought forward in these heraldic controversies naturally produced a want of confidence in the compilations of professed genealogists, which has unfortunately continued to the present day. In 1640 was published ‘*The Union of Honour*,’ illustrated by woodcuts of the armorial bearings of the English nobility, the author being James Yorke, a blacksmith of Lincoln. According to Fuller, he was an excellent workman in his profession, ‘inasmuch that if Pegasus himself would wear shoes, this man alone is fit to make them.’ ‘But,’ he adds, ‘he is a servant as well of Apollo as Vulcan, turning his stiddy (anvil) into a study, having lately set forth a book of heraldry, and although there be some mistakes (no hand so steady as always to hit the nail on the head), yet it is of singular use and industriously performed.’

Thirty-five years later (1675–6) appeared the well-known ‘*Baronage of England, or an Historical Account of the lives and most memorable actions of our English Nobility . . . deduced from public records, ancient historians, and other authorities*,’ by William Dugdale, Norroy King of Arms, in three folio volumes. Although a work of laborious research, the author’s friend, Anthony Wood, was able to supply him with numerous emendations ; and an anonymous writer (Charles Hornby), in 1738, makes some very severe comments on the compilation. As Dallaway truly observes, however, ‘imperfection can only be culpable when opportunities of improvement are neglected’—a charge which he does not appear to be disposed to bring against the Norroy King.

Towards the beginning of the eighteenth century (1709),

the indefatigable Arthur Collins produced the first edition of his '*Peerage of England*,' containing the descent, original creations, and most remarkable actions of the nobility of that country, with their marriages and issue, accompanied by the paternal coats of each family in blazon. The author makes the following modest statement in the preface:—'I have avoided all partial characters and reflexions, wherever I have found them strewn up and down in history, or other public volumes I have followed; for, next to being void of errors, I shall account myself happy to have given no offence.' Born in the year 1682, the worthy Arthur was the son of William Collins, Gentleman Usher to Queen Catherine of Braganza, and appears, at one time, to have been in business as a bookseller. Having received a liberal education and being inclined to the cultivation of letters, he conceived the arduous design of compiling a copious account of the English nobility; and the third and last edition of the work actually prepared by himself was published in 1756, four years before his death. In the preface to that edition he says:—

'I am not conscious of delivering the least untruth; my accounts of these and other families I have published being warranted by records and informations I cannot distrust, and I have endeavoured to discharge myself to everyone with the utmost impartiality, without any respect to persons or party interest, which my readers may be apprised of by the authorities I have cited, and which prove the difficulties of the undertaking, and the expense that attends the performance.'

He acknowledges the assistance which he had received from some of the greatest antiquaries of his time, and also the fact of several noblemen having favoured him with the perusal of their '*family evidences*.' 'For the execution of his task,' says Moule, in his '*Bibliotheca Heraldica*,' 'he was certainly entitled to the gratitude of the nobility, considering the pains he took to investigate, and the perspicuous manner in which he recorded, the illustrious deeds of their ancestors, tracing with a faithful and interesting pen the steps by which each family had risen to eminence. . . . The merit of his works is unquestionable, and to the present day they have continued the great authorities to which all subsequent writers on the same subject have had recourse.' Besides his '*Peerage*' and other genealogical works, Collins was the author of *Lives of Cecil Lord Burleigh* and *Edward the Black Prince*. Two editions of his '*Peerage*' (the fourth and fifth) appeared in 1767 and in 1779, while the latest and best edition (the sixth), 'greatly augmented and continued to the present time,' was

published by Sir Egerton Brydges, in nine octavo volumes, in the year 1812.

‘Of the materials and authorities,’ says the learned editor, ‘on which this work is built, little further requires to be said. The references at the bottom of almost every page speak for themselves. A long familiarity with all the minutiae of pedigree, and habits of research for more than twenty years, among original documents and ancient memorials, more especially the immense mass of genealogical MSS. in the British Museum, have given the editor a critical judgment on such subjects, which secures him from indiscriminate compilation. Something more might unquestionably have been done in some cases by aid of the respective families of whom he has treated, but he is not ashamed to confess that to the task of solicitation his pride would not submit. Besides, it might have restrained his pen in the exercise of that freedom, integrity, and truth, tempered by candour, with which he has most sedulously endeavoured to give the history of every family.’

In the inaugural address delivered on the occasion of his installation as Rector of the University of Edinburgh in 1866, Carlyle bears witness to the diligence and fidelity exhibited in old Collins’s ‘excellent book,’ and gratefully acknowledges the help which he had obtained from his laborious researches when writing his ‘Life of Oliver Cromwell.’ Besides finding the solution of everything he had expected, the ‘Sage of Chelsea’ gradually discovered this ‘immense fact,’ ‘the grand soul of ‘England’s history’—that the kings of England, from the Norman Conquest down to the times of Charles I.,

‘had actually, in a good degree, as far as they knew, been in the habit of appointing as peers those who *deserved* to be appointed. In general, I perceived, those peers of theirs were all royal men of a sort, with minds full of justice, valour, and humanity, and all kinds of qualities that men ought to have who rule over others. And then their genealogy, the kind of sons and descendants they had, this also was remarkable; for *there is a great deal more in genealogy than is generally believed at present*. I never heard tell of any clever man that came of entirely stupid people.’

He then refers to the ‘family stamp’ which is distinctly legible in many of our historical families, and to the vast importance of the ‘hereditary principle,’ contrasting the righteous fate of the foolish peer with the consistent demeanour of the pious, high-minded, grave, and dignified nobleman—the ‘good and valiant man’—with his kindness and pity for the poor, and his fine hospitalities. He is, however, forced to acknowledge that, in the days of the ‘Martyr King,’—

‘if a man was born a gentleman, and cared to lay out 10,000*l.* judiciously up and down among courtiers, he could be made a peer.

Under Charles II. it went on still faster, and has been going on with ever-increasing velocity, until we see the perfectly break-neck pace at which they are going now, so that now a peerage is a paltry kind of thing to what it was in those old times.'

The only portion of Carlyle's statement that appears to require qualification is that with regard to the period during which the practice of promoting deserving persons to the peerage prevailed. If Queen Elizabeth had the reputation of keeping the fountain of honour somewhat dry, her successor on the throne inclined to the other extreme, and scattered coronets in such a lavish manner that a waggish pamphlet was published which professed to teach the community 'How to remember the names of the Nobility!' Again, in the case of the Baronets of Ulster and Nova Scotia, there is good reason to believe that King James authorised the institution of the Order, nominally with a view to colonisation, but really that he might raise money in an easy way by the sale of hereditary titles.

For the first 'Peerage' relating to Scotland we are indebted to George Crawford, author of the 'Description of the Shire of Renfrew,' and of the 'Lives and Characters of the Scottish Officers of State.' His 'Peerage of Scotland'—a folio volume of 502 pages—was published in 1716, and appears to have been carefully compiled from various authentic sources. A copy of the work, interleaved and bound in two volumes, was purchased from the author's heirs by Mr. Cumming, of the Scottish Lyon Office. It contained various additions and corrections, probably made with a view to a second edition, which, however, the author did not live to issue. In 1764, Sir Robert Douglas published his 'Historical and Genealogical Account of the Peerage of Scotland,' in a single folio volume, extending to 718 pages, with copper-plate engravings of the arms.

'If,' he says in the preface, 'the most assiduous application for many years—if a painful inquiry into the public records and ancient chartularies—if an unwearied research after every degree of knowledge necessary for carrying on so arduous a task—if these have any merit, or deserve the favour of the public, the author flatters himself this work, on perusal, will not be found deficient. The chief and principal point the author had in view, and the great object of his attention, was, in a plain and distinct manner, to deduce the history of each family from its origin to the present generation, and to ascertain their genealogy and chronology by indisputable documents.'

Considering the limited nature of his materials, the 'Peerage' of Sir Robert Douglas may be regarded as a very creditable

performance. His desire to obtain authentic information is clearly indicated in the advertisement relative to his 'Baronage of Scotland,' published in 1798, in which he solicits those gentlemen who have not favoured him with an account of their families to transmit their 'writs or history' along with the *vouchers*. He also refers to certain mistakes and omissions in the 'Peerage,' which he hoped to rectify and supply in a contemplated Supplement.

The second and only other edition of Douglas's work appeared in 1813, under the editorship of Mr. John Philip Wood, in the shape of two folio volumes, together extending to upwards of 1,500 pages, with engravings of the arms of the peers. The royal charters quoted in the work are taken from the Register of the Great Seal down to the Regency of Robert, Duke of Albany, from Macfarlane's MS. transcripts in the Advocates' Library and other sources. An appendix embraces the creations of the titles in chronological order, with the destinations so far as ascertained, and other papers relating to the peerage. Since the publication of the first edition of Douglas in 1764, a good deal of light had been thrown upon the history of several important families, and many valuable additions and corrections were undoubtedly made by Mr. Wood; but seventy years have elapsed since his work was published, and during that period, to use the language of the author of 'Popular Genealogists,'

'a race of learned and accurate investigators have sprung up, who, approaching genealogy in a critical spirit, have brought entirely new resources to bear on it. Rejecting all that is not borne out by authentic evidence, they have applied themselves to the patient examination of the national records, the archives and chronicles of the monasteries, and the contents of private charter-chests. Each source has yielded its quota of facts, and these facts have been woven into genealogical biographies. Heraldry itself, after having been abandoned to coach-makers and undertakers, has again come into favour, having been found to be a valuable, if not indispensable, aid to the knowledge both of family and of national history.'

Let us hope, therefore, that a carefully compiled 'Peerage,' not only of Scotland, but also of the two other divisions of the United Kingdom, may yet be produced, written in a scholarly style, based upon the materials already referred to, and inspired by the noble sentiment of the Scottish judicial oath: 'The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.' *

* In the first volume of the 'Analecta Scotica' Mr. Maidment prints a selection of notes on Sir Robert Douglas's 'Peerage,' by the learned and accurate Lord Hailes, which do not seem to have been

Five years after the appearance of Crawford's 'Peerage of Scotland' (1725), the first attempt at an account of the Irish Peerage was given to the world in the shape of a folio volume by Aaron Crossley, herald painter, of Dublin, now comparatively scarce. It embraces a treatise on 'The Signification of most Things that are borne in Heraldry,' and, according to some later writers, is not to be depended on; but, like all original efforts in the same field, the work is entitled to be treated with indulgence. In 1754, encouraged by the success of Collins, an improved 'Irish Peerage,' in four octavo volumes, was issued by Mr. Lodge, Deputy Keeper of the Records in Bermingham Tower, who appears to have consulted numerous important sources of information. A second edition of the work, in seven volumes, was published in 1789, by the Rev. Mervyn Archdall, Rector of Slane, in the diocese of Meath, and author of 'Monasticon Hibernicum.'

Prior to the appearance of the last edition of Collins in 1812, numerous 'Peerages' had been published, of which we may mention those of Salmon (1751 and 1758), Guthrie (1763), Edmondson (1764), Kimber and Jacob (1766), Almon (1767-8), Barlow (1775), Debrett (1802), Brydges and Stockdale (1808), and Playfair (1809-12). Much was expected from Guthrie's 'Complete History of the English Peerage,' in which he was assisted by the well-known Ralph Bigland, Somerset Herald. The errors and absurdities, however, with which it abounds, are humorously shown up by Churchill in the following lines:—

‘Is there not Guthrie? Who, like him, can eall
All opposites to truth, and conquer all?’

utilised by Mr. Wood. 'His Lordship,' says Mr. Maidment, 'appears to have had a thorough contempt for peerage writers, which is not to be wondered at, as in general their works are little to be relied on. 'A true peerage,' he adds, 'would be really an interesting book.' Among the valuable books and papers of the late John Riddell, now in the Advocates' Library, are copies of both editions of Douglas's 'Peerage.' The first edition, interleaved throughout and annotated, contains numerous additions and corrections. Various MSS. and papers bearing upon the descent of the Scottish nobility are also inserted. Wood's edition—a large-paper copy—is similarly corrected and annotated, and Mr. Riddell has taken the greatest care to record the various sources, both printed and manuscript, from which he derived his invaluable information. Original MS. letters are inserted in several places. A living Scottish genealogist is understood to possess a copy of Wood's 'Douglas,' interspersed with numerous notes and emendations.

He calls forth living waters from the rock ;
 He calls forth children from the barren stock ;
 He, far beyond the springs of nature led,
 Makes women bring forth after they are dead ;
 He, on a curious, new, and happy plan,
 In wedlock's sacred band joins man to man ;
 And to complete the whole, most strange but true,
 By some rare magic makes them fruitful too ;
 Whilst from their loins, in the due course of years,
 Flows the rich blood of Guthrie's English peers.'

The elaborate production of Joseph Edmondson, 'Mowbray Herald Extraordinary,' and author of the 'Complete Body of Heraldry,' consists of five folio volumes, and was originally published in numbers, the total cost being twenty-five guineas. Some of the plates of arms, which are well executed although not in the best taste, were engraved by Francesco Bartolozzi, R.A. The Rev. Frederic Barlow, in the preface to his 'Complet English Peerage,' quaintly informs his readers that, 'as unbiassed authors, we shall not be afraid to pull aside the ermine, to show the corruption which lies hidden behind ; and our reverence for truth will embolden us to disclose the weakness of the head, even when encircled with the diadem' ! The work contains translations of the mottos, for the benefit of unlearned readers, 'a circumstance which has never been attended to in any other Peerage.' William Playfair's performance, entitled 'British Family Antiquity,' extends to nine quarto volumes, of which the first five embrace the respective Peerages of England, Scotland, and Ireland, while the remaining four treat of the Baronets. The author, who was a younger brother of the well-known mathematician, obtained patents for various inventions, engaged in numerous speculations, and was a prolific writer on politics and other subjects. His reputation as a genealogist, however, is not of the highest order. According to the late Mr. Maidment, he was a 'whole-sale manufacturer of pedigrees,' and 'notoriously inaccurate as the compiler of the nine dull and ponderous tomes,' to which we have already referred. Playfair informs his readers that some of the pedigrees in his 'Baronetage' were compiled on the authority of a manuscript written a hundred years previously 'by one whose certain knowledge reached back to the middle of the seventeenth century.' In other words, the manuscript in question was written about 1711, and the mysterious author's 'certain knowledge' extended to 1650. Supposing him to have been 'threescore years and ten' when he penned the manuscript, he must have been born about 1641, and consequently was only nine years of age at the date to

which his 'certain knowledge' is said to have extended. Playfair coolly adds, that 'in all essential particulars, the manuscript agrees with the documents on record, and *supplies* *chasms* with regard to facts of less importance'! A chasm in a pedigree is a somewhat serious blemish, but the author of 'British Family Antiquity' is equal to the emergency, and does not hesitate to supply the missing link. He elsewhere acknowledges that 'precision of circumstances' is, in some cases, a good ground for suspicion, while in others it is the test of truth and reality. In the proof of certain transactions, precision is very properly regarded as highly important; and the fabricators of pedigrees frequently endeavour to impose upon credulous and inexperienced readers, by setting forth their fictions in very minute detail.

Of existing 'Peerages,' besides those of Burke and Foster, to which we shall presently refer, a few words must be said regarding two old and popular publications, viz. Debrett and Lodge. In the issue for 1883, under the editorship of Dr. Robert H. Mair, Debrett's 'Peerage and Titles of Courtesy' is said to have reached the venerable age of 170 years. On the assumption that the work had appeared annually, this would imply that its first publication was early in the eighteenth century. On referring, however, to Moule's Catalogue, we find that John Debrett first entered the 'Peerage' field in 1802. The partner and successor of Almon, already referred to, he was a respectable bookseller in Piccadilly, and died in 1823. It does not appear to whose 'goodwill' Almon succeeded; but we presume that he also had one or more predecessors in the genealogical line, and that, on the strength of what may be termed an hereditary fiction, the editor of the latest edition of Debrett claims the highly respectable antiquity which is indicated on his title-page. Besides including a good deal of useful information respecting the collateral branches of the various peers, the work embraces upwards of sixty pages relative to their predecessors, and is illustrated with 600 woodcuts of armorial bearings. In this handy small octavo volume of nearly 800 pages, the alphabetical arrangement includes: (1) surnames of peers; (2) their superior and inferior titles; (3) titles borne by their eldest sons; and (4) extinct, dormant, or abeyant peerages which are still represented in the female line; while the Appendix contains a series of useful indexes and other matter. The editor states in the preface, that during the past year he submitted proofs to every adult whose name is mentioned in the work and whose address he could procure, and that he received nearly 19,000 replies, with

marks of correction or approval. Accordingly, he appears to be fully justified in stating, on his title-page, that the work has been 'personally revised by the nobility.' Debrett's '*Baronetage and Knightage*,' by the same editor—a volume very similar in size and style to the '*Peerage*'—contains 800 armorial illustrations, and the edition for 1883 professes to represent the seventy-fifth year of publication. In the course of a speech in the House of Lords in April 1876, Lord Chancellor Cairns pronounced Debrett to be 'a depository of information which he never opened without amazement or admiration.'

The latest issue of the '*Peerage and Baronetage of the British Empire*,' bearing the name of Edmund Lodge, late Norroy King of Arms, is also for the current year, and constitutes the fifty-second edition, 'revised and enlarged.' It forms a handsome large octavo volume of nearly 900 pages, of which the first 656 are devoted to the Peers, and the remaining portion to the Baronets and Knights—the notices of the Baronets being very brief and unaccompanied by armorial bearings. The '*Annual Peerage*,' which was first published in 1832 under the name of Mr. Lodge, had been compiled for more than a quarter of a century by three intelligent sisters of the name of Limes, the last of whom continued her connexion with the work till her death in 1856, at a very advanced age, the Norroy King having predeceased her in 1839. For some years after her decease, the superintendence of '*Lodge's Peerage*' was entrusted to Mr. Edward Walford, the editor of '*County Families*' and other well-known genealogical and antiquarian works. As a companion '*Genealogical Volume*,' containing concise historical sketches of their ancestry, is occasionally issued, the notices of the peers in the annual publication are comparatively short. The latest issue of the '*Genealogical Volume*' was in 1859. Of the same size and style as the '*Annual Peerage and Baronetage*,' it consists of 870 pages, the same armorial illustrations being prefixed to each notice as in the annual publication. 'The earlier story of the ancestors of the nobility,' which the volume contains, although by no means exhaustive, is, on the whole, pretty satisfactory—sometimes extending to three or four closely printed pages, as in the case of the Dukes of Norfolk and Northumberland, while the notice of his Grace of Hamilton occupies nearly twice that space. Many of the memoirs, however, do not exceed half a page, and are consequently very incomplete. The ancestry of the baronets is very briefly stated, three or four different families being sometimes summarily disposed of on a single page. Both Debrett and Lodge are

highly creditable compilations ; and, for ordinary purposes of reference, they are more easily consulted than either of their more bulky rivals. The fact of the one being now within thirty years of the close of its second century, and of the other having reached its fifty-second edition, is the most convincing proof that can be adduced of the high estimation in which these volumes continue to be held.

The ‘Genealogical and Heraldic Dictionary of the British Empire,’ by Sir Bernard Burke, Ulster King of Arms, is a much more elaborate production than either Debrett or Lodge, the volume for 1883 extending to nearly 1,750 royal octavo pages of double columns, and forming the forty-fifth edition of the work. The introductory portion (128 pages) embraces (1) a ‘key’ to the work, in the form of an extensive and useful index, and (2) an account of the royal lineage, and other valuable information. About 200 pages at the end of the volume are devoted to the ‘Spiritual Lords,’ foreign titles, tables of precedence, &c., while the Peerage and Baronetage proper occupies 1,420 pages. Unlike Debrett and Lodge, Sir Bernard mixes up the peers and baronets under one alphabetical arrangement, which we consider an objectionable and unheraldic course. Although the baronets undoubtedly constitute a highly important body, it must be borne in mind that, notwithstanding their hereditary titles, they are merely *commoners*, and ought therefore to be kept quite apart from the peers of the realm. Some thirty or forty years ago, a great clamour was made by certain members of the order respecting their supposed ‘privileges,’ which induced more than one competent authority to expose the utter groundlessness of their claims. These claims embraced the right to be styled ‘honourable,’ and to carry a coronet and supporters in their armorial achievements ; the wearing, on State occasions, the insignia of the ancient *Equites Aurati* (a thumb ring, gilt spurs, and the collar of SS) ; the holding of ‘chapters ;’ the same privileges at the universities as the nobility ; and the use of the title of ‘master’ by their eldest sons. Every herald is aware that the historical designation of ‘master,’ which was probably derived from France, has been exclusively borne in Scotland, from the beginning of the fifteenth century, by the heirs apparent of certain noblemen, and is now confined to the eldest sons of barons and a few viscounts. Occasionally, according to Sir George Mackenzie, ‘the uncles of lords, after the death of their elder brother, though he left a son, were called masters, till the nephew had a son ; for which,’ adds the learned Lord Advocate, ‘I know no other reason, but that

‘because they wanted a title they took this!’ When the Scottish order of baronets was first established in 1625, a good deal of jealousy was shown by some of the ‘minor barons,’ originally ‘heritable counsellors to the king,’ in connexion with the question of precedence. An amusing illustration of this rivalry is given by Sir Andrew Agnew in his ‘*Sheriffs of Galloway*.’ Dunbar of Mochrum, an old baron, and Sir William Maxwell, the first baronet of Monreith, being at a county meeting, the newly made baronet was going to take precedence. ‘Mochrum before Monreith, Sir William,’ quoth the Laird of Mochrum, a tall and powerful man. ‘Tut, tut, Mochrum, do not stand upon ceremony; I will send you a pipe of claret to drink my health.’ ‘That is another matter, Sir William; pass on!’ Next time they met, the same scene was re-enacted; Sir William remonstrated, on which old Mochrum explained, ‘The claret is all drunk, Sir William!’ Even in these later days, similar misunderstandings occasionally occur. Not many years ago, a worthy carpet knight, associated with the woollen trade, happened to meet an untitled military officer of good family at the house of an intimate and outspoken friend. When dinner was announced the new-fledged knight was proceeding to walk out of the room before the son of Mars, when the host coolly held him back, saying, ‘Na, na, the warrior before the wabster (weaver) in my hoose’!

To return to Sir Bernard. In his ‘*Prefatory Notice*,’ the Ulster King informs his readers that the various memoirs of the peers and baronets are submitted to ‘the revision of the families themselves,’ and, *pace* Sir Egerton Brydges, it is difficult to imagine how any such work as a Peerage could be satisfactorily prepared without such assistance. We have good reason to believe that the editor makes considerable efforts to obtain accurate information, and year after year the volume presents evidence of improvement.

To say nothing of certain serious omissions, Sir Bernard’s genealogy of the Queen in some of the earlier editions of his ‘*Peerage*’ was objectionably redundant, in respect of the frequent digressions into unimportant lines of female descent, for the obvious purpose of introducing very ordinary persons who happen to be descended from royalty, and who are therefore, as was alleged, entitled to quarter the royal arms. If space permitted, it would be easy to show that this preposterous doctrine is utterly opposed to the principles and practice of sound heraldry. In Scotland, at least, if any such individual should be rash enough to act upon the theory in question, the result might prove somewhat serious. In the words of an

eminent jurist and herald already referred to: ‘By the civil law, he who bears and uses another man’s arms to his prejudice, *vel in ejus scandalum aut ignominiam*, is to be punished arbitrarily at the discretion of the judge; but he who usurps his prince’s arms *loses his head*, and his goods are confiscated.’ The erroneous assertion that the Harden Scotts, in the person of Lord Polwarth, are entitled to claim the male representation of the house of Buccleuch, is given by the author of ‘Popular Genealogists’ as an example of Sir Bernard’s inaccuracy. The same critic also refers to the pretty common occurrence of heraldic errors, the verbal blazon and the illustrative woodcut being frequently at variance. Thus a coat described as quartered is, in many instances, represented as a plain coat, only one of the quarters, and very generally the least important, being engraved in the illustration. It is gratifying, however, to be able to add that neither these heraldic irregularities, nor the redundancies in the royal lineage, occur in the more recent editions of Ulster’s ‘Peerage,’ in which, moreover, much greater accuracy appears in many of the genealogies; and, as might have been expected, the Irish pedigrees are particularly complete and satisfactory.

Certain pedigrees in some of Sir Bernard’s other genealogical works have been repeatedly assailed; and, in numerous instances, it is to be feared that the criticisms are by no means unfounded. The learned author already referred to devotes a very considerable portion of his little volume to a trenchant *exposé* of two notorious genealogies embraced in a comparatively recent edition of the ‘Landed Gentry,’ which we trust will have the wholesome effect of preventing the republication of any such glaring absurdities. One of the two distinguished families in question is seriously traced from a Roman lieutenant mentioned by Tacitus; and the existing representative is said to possess a marriage settlement dated in the twenty-first year of the reign of a more or less fabulous Scottish monarch, yclept Kenneth III. It unfortunately happens, moreover, that the names of *both* parties in this venerable contract pertain to the male sex! The other family is described as having sprung from a valvassor of Aquitaine, claiming descent from certain Danish Vikinggars of the ninth century, whose explanatory exclamation ‘in the rude Latin of the day,’ respecting an ugly act of sacrilege, is alleged to have given rise to the patronymic of his house! The armorial bearings are in charming keeping with the pedigree, embracing as they do a dexter hand vested with a shirt-sleeve, presenting a tempting shoulder of mutton to a hungry lion—a somewhat startling

example of the heraldic debasement, of which Mr. Seton gives several ludicrous instances in his 'Law and Practice of Heraldry in Scotland.' Had the author of the 'Landed Gentry' confined himself to such palpable 'imagination,' serious criticism might have been regarded as wholly unnecessary; but when a King of Arms represents the battle of Bannockburn as having been fought in the year 1448, besides giving two different dates to the less illustrious field of Beaugé,* it is surely time to remind him that historical inaccuracy cannot be treated with the same leniency as the self-evident genealogical fables to which we have referred. Of course, Sir Bernard's official position, as the head of the Irish College of Arms, imparts a certain stamp of authority to his various publications, which they would not otherwise possess. Hence, in his case at least, the greatest care and caution ought to be invariably adopted in the investigation of the pedigrees transmitted to him for publication. Whether it can reasonably be expected that the editor of such an extensive work as the 'Landed Gentry' should critically examine every genealogy that is placed in his hands is perhaps open to question. The mere unvouched assertion of the supposed representative of any family ought certainly not to be accepted as 'gospel,' even although such a course should render the editor liable to the charge of taking too uncharitable a view of human nature. That has long been the convenient plea of the so-called 'heraldic artists' and 'professors of genealogy,' who complacently prosper on the munificence of the *nouveaux riches*. It is much to be regretted that these unscrupulous adventurers are no longer liable to the salutary punishment administered to certain framers of false pedigrees in the sixteenth century—to wit, *the loss of an ear*.

By a somewhat curious coincidence, the character of ordinary Peerage writers has been happily drawn by a distinguished

* The battle-field of Beaugé, on the plains of Anjou, has long been a favourite locality with amateur genealogists for the death of imaginary ancestors; and the numerous competitors for the honour of slaying the Duke of Clarence, in that encounter, constitute an historical mystery, which ought surely to be cleared up. Besides the gallant Earl of Buchan, afterwards Constable of France, members of the families of Swinton, Carmichael, and Buchanan have been respectively represented as having given the death-blow to Thomas Plantagenet. Fordun mentions all these, except Buchanan, as having been collectively concerned in the duke's slaughter; while the author of the 'Lay of the Last Minstrel' attributes the deed to the Knight of Swinton.

namesake of Sir Bernard's. 'These gentle historians,' says Edmund Burke, 'dip their pens in nothing but the milk of human kindness. They seek no farther for merit than the preamble of a patent or the inscription of a tomb. Every man created a peer is a hero ready made. . . . Every general officer is a Marlborough; every statesman a Burleigh; every judge a Murray or a Yorke.'

The last work to which we intend to allude is Mr. Joseph Foster's 'Peerage, Baronetage, and Knightage of the British Empire,' of which the issue for the current year forms the fourth edition. It consists of two handsome royal octavo volumes, embracing the Peerage and Baronetage respectively, and constitutes a formidable rival to Ulster's annual publication. The Peerage volume extends to nearly 900 pages, about 100 of which are devoted to an index, a list of peers in order of precedence, and the lineage of the Royal Family, which is accompanied by several useful genealogical tables.

Influenced, perhaps, by the example of the ancient heralds, who sounded their trumpets (hence *Blazon*) before declaring the bearings of the knights who presented themselves at the lists, Mr. Foster certainly does not fail, in his preface, to 'blow his own trumpet' with great vigour, if not with very good taste, or even truthfulness. Among other things, he informs his readers that his 'Peerage' is 'gradually acquiring an increasing reputation for possessing a greater amount of original genealogical information than any other kindred work.' Doubtless any competent critic will have little difficulty in discovering a good deal of very *original* information! And now, forsooth, he most ingratiously turns his back upon Douglas and Wood, in whom he elsewhere firmly trusts, and refers to their 'many inaccuracies,' which *he* was not the first to detect. He writes as if he were the only genealogist who ever considered that the lineages and creations of certain Scottish peerages stood in need of revision. Thus, he complacently regardshimself as the discoverer of the true destination of the Ruthven barony, to which Riddell devotes no fewer than ten pages in his smaller work on Scottish peerage law, published exactly fifty years ago! In the earlier editions of Mr. Foster's 'Peerage,' it was naturally to be expected that errors in names and dates should be pretty numerous; but we were hardly prepared to find even an amateur genealogist misspelling an historic surname, converting a well-known English peer into an Irish representative, and prefixing 'Lady' to the name of a baron's daughter espoused to a commoner; to say nothing of other similar blemishes.

With regard to the genealogies of the peers, while the great houses of Hamilton, Norfolk, and Northumberland only occupy about two pages each in Mr. Foster's volume, from three to three and a half pages are assigned to such comparatively unimportant titles as Anglesey, Egmont, Charlemont, Molesworth, Clurston, and Carrington. The 'bold Buccleuch' is honoured with only a page and a half; the Duke of Montrose, Marquis of Exeter, Earl of Home, Barons Hastings and De Ros, each with a single page; and the titles of Strathmore, Le Despencer, and Torphichen with a considerably smaller space. If, again, we compare the amount of room allotted by Burke and Foster respectively to the three distinguished families of Derby, Abercorn, and Leinster—which we select as representatives of the three different sections of the United Kingdom—we find that, roughly speaking, Sir Bernard devotes three pages to each of them, while under Mr. Foster's treatment little more than one-third of that space is regarded as sufficient. In the notice of the Earl of Derby, Mr. Foster begins the lineage with Sir John Stanley who died in 1414, while Ulster furnishes particulars respecting seven or eight previous generations, besides giving a much fuller account of most of the later representatives of the family, and especially of the last Earl of Derby, the distinguished scholar and statesman. Sir Bernard also introduces an interesting note relative to the origin of the crest, respecting which Mr. Foster is silent. In the case of the Duke of Abercorn, the early history of the family is very briefly stated by Mr. Foster, several generations being entirely omitted. Of the first five Earls of Abercorn, he condescends to mention only the first, from whom he jumps summarily to the sixth. Sir Bernard, on the other hand, is much fuller and more satisfactory, and devotes nearly half a column of small type to the Dukedom of Chatellerault. In the notice of the Irish Dukedom of Leinster, it was naturally to be expected that the Ulster King should provide an interesting and comprehensive pedigree. When, however, we turn from the historic houses of Stanley, Hamilton, and Fitzgerald, to the comparatively unknown, though highly respectable, peerages of recent times, the treatment of the rival genealogists affords an equally striking contrast of an entirely opposite character. Thus, while the notice of Baron Carrington in Burke does not extend beyond a page and a half, Foster's pedigree occupies no less than three and a half pages. Burke begins one generation earlier, and also gives a much fuller account of the family proper than Foster, who occupies nearly three-fourths of his space with a detailed notice of six different

cadets of the family—most of them entirely unknown to fame—who still adhere to the world-wide patronymic of Smith, which was exchanged for Carrington by the head of the house in 1839. Not content, however, with the male descendants of these illustrious collaterals, Mr. Foster introduces the children of all the married daughters down to the latest birth reported to him in 1882. A younger son of one of the cadets, born in 1788, is transformed into a Pannefote, and *his* descendants are also circumstantially accounted for, including three Silesian grandchildren, the offspring of a daughter. The wholesale specification of remote cousins and the female lines of descent may, perhaps, be intensely interesting to the parties immediately concerned, who, no doubt, dearly love to see their names recorded in a British Peerage; but such minute details cannot possibly be edifying to the general public, who, in a professedly national work, would naturally much prefer the substitution of matter possessing historical interest. Many other examples could easily be given of Mr. Foster's objectionable practice of abbreviating the ancestral and historical details of distinguished families, and of swelling out the later generations of unimportant genealogies. A certain noble Duke to whom we have incidentally referred has been so largely blessed in his quiver that he has been favoured with between seventy and eighty descendants; but only about one-half of these are honoured with a place in Mr. Foster's pages, in order, we presume, to make room for the numerous Smiths, Browns, and Robinsons, who constitute a very important section of the population of the United Kingdom.

The space occupied by Burke and Foster respectively in their notices of the Mar peerage is very much the same; but while Ulster assigns a separate article to each of the claimants—describing the one as Earl of Mar and Kellie, and the other as the Earl of Mar of the old creation, in the capacity of heir-general of his maternal uncle the ninth earl—Mr. Foster only acknowledges one Earl of Mar, in the person of the former. Our space will not permit us to enter upon the various intricate questions connected with this celebrated titular dispute; but we shall remark, in passing, that the resolution of the House of Lords is maintained to have been erroneous both in law and in fact by many competent judges. The question of jurisdiction in matters relating to the peerage of Scotland has long been anxiously considered by legal antiquaries, and fresh interest in the subject has been lately aroused by the introduction of a Bill by the Lord Chancellor with reference to the election of Scottish representative peers.

Before the discussion which preceded the second reading of that Bill, a petition was presented by Lord Galloway which bore names 'representative of all the men learned in Scottish law and history.' After stating several valid grounds for their application, the petitioners humbly prayed, 'That in any legislation bearing upon the peerage of Scotland your Lordships will provide for the jurisdiction of the Court of Session, subject to appeal to your right honourable House as a judicial tribunal; and that in the case of petitions relating thereto her Most Gracious Majesty be advised to direct reference, in the first instance, to the said Court of Session.' It cannot be denied that the views of the petitioners are almost universally held in Scotland by those who appear to have the best right to speak upon the subject; and it is well known that similar opinions were entertained by the great peerage lawyer, John Riddell, by the late Earl of Crawford, and by many other competent authorities who have passed away. It certainly does not seem to follow that because all Scottish peers became British peers at the union of the kingdoms of England and Scotland, their rights and privileges should necessarily be regulated by the law and practice applicable to the English peerage. The constitution of many of the Scottish peerages is entirely different from that of English peerages; and accordingly, it appears to be both reasonable and desirable that, in the first instance at least, all questions connected with them should be discussed and considered by a Scottish judicature, in accordance with the principles of Scottish law, and the practice which prevailed before the Union. Such a course of procedure would be calculated to produce some highly beneficial results, including greater despatch in the settlement of claims, a considerable reduction in the relative costs, and a more satisfactory clearing up of most of the difficult points of Scottish peerage law. The tone of the discussion already referred to was all that could be desired. It is, however, to be regretted that the Chancellor's Bill is confined to the removal of only one of the two grievances for which a remedy was suggested by the Select Committee of the House of Lords, viz. the want of an efficient mode of checking the votes of pretenders to peerages at the elections at Holyrood. The proposed removal of the major grievance—involving a return to the old practice of the Court of Session having at least preliminary jurisdiction in Scottish peerage claims—is unfortunately altogether ignored. In these days of scientific research, it is surely not desirable to perpetuate the expediency doctrines of Lord Mansfield, or the free-and-easy way in which, according

to Lord Campbell, the English law lords were in the habit of fulfilling their functions in the case of peerage claims. The remarks of the two eminent Scottish lawyers—Lords Moncreiff and Watson, who both took a prominent part in the debate—are well worthy of serious consideration; and the conciliatory statement of the Lord Chancellor leads us to hope that the Bill will be so amended in Committee as to meet the views which we have ventured to indicate.*

A very special feature in Mr. Foster's 'Peerage' is the style in which the illustrations of the armorial bearings are executed. Many of them are very spirited and effectively drawn. As favourable examples, we may refer to the achievements of the Dukes of Athole, Leinster, and St. Albans; the Marquis of Drogheda; the Earls of Huntingdon, Crawford, Moray, Perth, and Zetland; Viscounts Monck and Mountgarret; and Barons Braybrooke, Dornier, Zonche, Haldon, and Teignmouth. As a rule, the crests are large and prominent, in accordance with the practice followed during the best period of heraldry; and the escutcheons are invariably free from the highly objectionable 'pothooks' of the past and present centuries. Most sound heralds disapprove of the use of two or more crests, and their artistic treatment is always a difficult matter. This, however, is fairly well done in the achievements of the Earl of Warwick and Lord Polwarth, particularly the former; but no draughtsman on the face of the globe could make a pleasing representation of the armorial bearings of the Duke of Buckingham, with his gallery of *five* crests, looking not unlike a set of nine-pins; or even of those of the Earls of Wharfedale and Dufferin, who each carry *three*. A very startling heraldic anomaly appears in the case of Lord Haddington's crest—a plume of feathers issuing from a ducal coronet, which is placed upon a wreath! *A propos* of crests, a prudish critic might, perhaps, be disposed to question the applicability of the term 'proper' to the female figure which surmounts Lord Clifden's helmet, even although she happens to be 'crined.' For this, however, Mr. Foster is not in any way responsible.

In a good many instances the arms are disposed on a *banner*,

* Since this article was written, the Chancellor's Bill has been reprinted 'as amended on report,' but we are sorry to find that the power now granted to the Committee of Privileges to refer peerage claims to the Court of Session, for their consideration and report, is merely permissive; while the right of adjudicating on precedence questions—hitherto determined by the Court of Session—is transferred to the House of Lords.

of which the staff is held by one or both of the supporters. In some of these cases the crest is placed above, and in others at the side of the banner. As good examples of this arrangement, we may cite the bearings of the Dukes of Marlborough and Newcastle, and of the Earl of Dunraven and Baron Sandys. One of the most objectionable and unheraldic expedients in Mr. Foster's illustrations is the frequent disposition of the coronet *below* the escutcheon, which is enough to make the good old Scottish Lyon King, Sir David Lindsay, turn in his coffin. In the case of Lord Eldon's achievement, the base of the escutcheon rests upon the centre ball of the coronet, while the two other balls on each side are utilised for the hind feet of the guardant lions which constitute the supporters! Should the 'Comic History of Heraldry' reach a second edition, we seriously recommend the author to take a hint from some of Mr. Foster's grotesque illustrations. In numerous instances, we find a coronet without a helmet, and in others a helmet without a coronet. In a few cases the form of the mantling is, to say the least, eccentric; as in the bearings of the Duke of Argyll, the Marquis of Normanby, the Earl of Scarborough, and Baron de Clifford. When the couché shield is adopted, sometimes the dexter and sometimes the sinister chief is placed under the helmet, the latter being the arrangement warranted by heraldic practice. In all the engraved examples of couché shields in Laing's well-known 'Catalogues of Ancient Seals,' the *sinister* chief is placed under the helmet. In a good many instances, the couché arrangement is overdone, the escutcheon being much nearer a horizontal than a perpendicular position.

The treatment of supporters is frequently very questionable. In many cases they are much too large in proportion to the rest of the achievement. The supporters of Lord Glasgow's coat consist of a man and a lion, the former being head and shoulders higher than the latter. In the case of Lord Lytton's achievement, however, the magnitude of the supporters produces rather a good effect. We cannot say the same of those of Viscount Kenmure and Baron Fitzgerald (naked savages), whose lower limbs are so disposed within the confines of hatchments as to suggest the idea of great personal discomfort. Occasionally, the supporters, instead of carrying out the original idea of sustaining the escutcheon, are placed quite above it, devoting their energies to the support of the helmet. It must, however, be acknowledged that this arrangement is occasionally to be found in ancient charter seals. In the case of Lord Bath's achievement, the dexter supporter (a rein-

deer) is poised on the apex of a conché shield, throwing the entire responsibility of sustaining it upon his fellow, who is happily a powerful lion. One of Lord Barrington's two griffins is apparently in the act of preparing to swallow the beard of the Capuchin, whose head constitutes the crest. The dexter supporter of Lord Sheffield's shield—a regardant lion—appears to be naturally very much astonished by the shape and magnitude of its caudal accompaniment; and the heads of the greyhounds which support the escutcheons of Lords Ashburnham and Romilly are pointed upwards in a most unnatural manner; in the latter case (where the crest happens to be a crescent) suggesting the idea that the unfortunate animals are barking at the moon! In many cases, where a stag forms either crest or supporter, the horns are extravagantly large, while the same animal is frequently very badly drawn. The Duke of Roxburghe's two savages have the appearance of being engaged in an animated discussion over the top of the escutcheon; while those of Lord Kimberley are evidently inspired by the injunction of the motto—'Frappe fort'—their clubs being uplifted in a very formidable manner.

As actual errors of blazon, we may mention that in certain quarters of the Duke of Buccleuch's coat, the arms of France (three fleurs-de-lis) are disposed 'one and two,' instead of 'two and one,' the latter arrangement being in accordance with the invariable treatment of three similar charges. The verbal blazon of Lord Normanby's third quarter gives a bordure compony *argent* and *azure*, while in the relative illustration, the bordure is charged with fleurs-de-lis and ermine spots alternately. The mark of cadency (a crescent) in Lord Norbury's shield is preposterously large, covering as it does the upper portion of the cross which forms the principal charge in the first and fourth quarters; while the escallops in the two other quarters are unlike any shell that ever was seen, bearing a much greater resemblance to large-headed nails with their points resting upon crescents. We have reason to believe that Lord Somers, with his double surname, is entitled to bear a quartered shield, whereas only a plain coat appears in the woodcut of his arms. The right of the premier Earl of England to quarter the arms of Chetwynd has been questioned by a very competent herald; who, on the other hand, objects to the omission of the bearings of Craggs in the escutcheon of Lord St. Germans.

Mr. Foster's 'Baronetage and Knightage' is a volume of very nearly the same bulk as his 'Peerage.' The introductory

portion contains alphabetical lists of the Baronets of Ireland and Scotland, and a catalogue of all the Baronets of the three kingdoms, according to their precedence. The list of the Scottish Baronets is from a manuscript in the Advocates' Library, by the well-known genealogist Robert Milne, and embraces some curious and valuable information. The following note is inserted at the end of the letter C in Milne's list :—

'Mr. John Bannatine, minister of Lanark, having taken charge of the sons of the Duchess of Hamilton, her Grace procured for him, as a reward, a warrant of this nature (i.e. blank patent of baronetcy), which he sold for 100*l.* to his parishioner, Carmichael of Bonnington, who was at once recognised as a baronet. The title was held without dispute by his descendants till they became extinct in the male line, on the death of Sir William Carmichael-Baillie, of Lanington and Bonnington, in July 1738.' ('Genealogist,' vol. ii. p. 66.)

At the end of the 'Baronetage,' Mr. Foster prints, under the designation of 'Chaos,' a list of 'the more questionable assumptions,' which he has excluded from the main body of his work; and also a series of 'explanatory notes' relative to other doubtful pedigrees; in all, sixty-five cases. Every genealogist is aware that, unfortunately, no means have ever been provided, as in the case of peers, to ascertain a baronet's right of succession, and it is well known that in consequence of the great looseness which formerly prevailed in the matter of 'services,' many *soi-disant* baronets—especially in the Scottish order—are more than questionable. Whether or not Mr. Foster is in every case correct in his suspicions, is, of course, another matter. For example, he excludes Murray of Philiphaugh from the Baronetage, apparently because Milne states that the patent is limited to heirs of the body: whereas, in point of fact, the patent is to be found in the Great Seal Register, and it extends the succession to heirs male. Not a shadow of a doubt can exist as to Sir Reginald Cathcart's right to his baronetcy, and yet his is one of the titles which Mr. Foster has the audacity to call in question. If 'further particulars are much required to substantiate the pedigree in 'the Baronetage,' how is the infallible genealogist able to inform his readers that the Earl of Cathcart is apparently heir-presumptive to the baronetcy? The title of Sir William Broun of Colstoun (erroneously printed *Coulston* by Mr. Foster) is also excluded from the body of the work, although acknowledged by Burke, Lodge, and other well-known genealogists. Mr. Foster is not the only objector to the Broun baronetcy, which has been a favourite target for the arrows of

various critics since the 'service' of the grandfather of the present baronet in 1826. We have reason to believe, however, that the right to the dignity is altogether unassailable. Again, it appears to be quite certain that John Malcolm of Balbeadie was in 1665 created a baronet, when a very young man, during the lifetime of his father; and probably the supposed doubt could be cleared up by reference to the family papers and the public records. On the other hand, however, it cannot be denied that a good many questionable assumptions have been properly relegated to 'Chaos.' Let us hope that at no very distant period some steps may be taken to place the entire order of baronets on a satisfactory and unchallengeable footing.

As in the 'Peerage,' we have several instances in the 'Baronetage' of undue prominence being given to certain comparatively obscure families. Thus, under the notice of Sir Robert Peel, which extends to upwards of four pages, we find a detailed account of no fewer than five cadets; while the pedigree of Sir Hickman Beckett Bacon, premier baronet of the United Kingdom, is disposed of in less than a single page; and such ancient families as Haggerston, Swinburne, Grierson, and Piers, are still more briefly treated.

In the notice of Sir Walter Buchanan-Riddell, John Riddell of Grange, in Fifeshire, is said to have married Helen, eldest daughter of Sir Michael Balfour, Baronet, Lyon King of Arms; but the only member of the Balfour family who ever wore the Scottish armorial crown was the well-known Sir *James* Balfour. In the same connexion, it is erroneously represented that the estate of Glen Riddell was inherited by John's descendants, whereas it really passed to the elder line of the family. Again, in the genealogy of Sir Thomas Cockburn-Campbell, Mr. Foster states, in a footnote, that Mrs. Murray Allan was the 'only child' of her father, John Campbell of Auchalader (usually spelt *Achalader*). In point of fact, however, she had a brother, Captain John Livingston Campbell, of Achalader, who was thrice married and had issue. Under another title (Campbell of Aberuchill), it is stated that the father of the first baronet fell at the battle of Worcester, while he was unquestionably in his grave upwards of ten years before that event. If our space permitted, many similar blunders might easily be cited, which we trust will ere long be corrected, a course which has already been followed in regard to some of the more serious errors in the previous editions of the 'Baronetage.'

As in the case of the 'Peerage,' the armorial illustrations are, speaking generally, very creditably executed; and in many

instances the drawing is vigorous and effective. Most of the couché shields are correctly placed, but a good many of the helmets are open to heraldic criticism, on the ground of their not being in the form usually assigned to baronets. The first and fourth quarters of Sir Coutts Lindsay's escutcheon are said to be within a bordure charged with fourteen stars, *ensigned with a pennon*, which last condition really applies to the tent which constitutes the crest! The bordure of the Auchinbreck escutcheon is blazoned 'compony *ermine* and *vert*,' while the accompanying woodcut represents it as counter-compony. In the case of the various Campbell coats, the arrangement of the gyrons is not uniform, the alternate tinctures being sometimes *or* and *sable*, and sometimes *sable* and *or*. Good heralds differ in opinion as to which of the two is the correct blazon, but the author of a Baronetage ought invariably to adopt either the one or the other.

But for Mr. Foster's presumptuous assertions respecting his heraldic and genealogical infallibility, and the highly offensive manner in which he refers to certain well-known authorities—whose general accuracy and intelligence have never been disputed by competent judges—we should not have spoken so plainly of the many errors and weaknesses of a mere amateur in a perplexing field. To say the least, it is inconsistent for the author of a Peerage to acknowledge, in his latest preface, his obligations to the officials of the Scottish College of Arms, while, at the same time, he is circulating, over the length and breadth of the empire, reprints of certain ill-natured articles in one of his other publications, in which he attacks the Lyon King and his courteous and accomplished *collaborateur* with regard to a pedigree of the family of Marjoribanks, which is not possessed of much general interest. Mr. Foster goes the length of stating that 'descents are "solemnly" recorded in 'pedigree form (in the Lyon Office), though absolutely devoid 'of evidence.' The points in question have been ably handled in a recent number of the Scottish 'Journal of Jurisprudence,' to which reference may be made by anyone who happens to be interested in the dispute. Suffice it to state, however, that the Lyon Office pedigree still appears to be absolutely unshaken by Mr. Foster's elaborate arguments. But our amateur genealogist does not rest satisfied with an unwarranted attempt to throw discredit on the Scottish heraldic officials. In the preface to his 'List of Members of Parliament,' when commenting on the existing sources of information on Scottish genealogy and topography, Mr. Foster assigns the highest place to 'Wood's Peerage by Douglas'—meaning, of course, 'Douglas's Peerage by Wood.' We have already referred to

the character of that work as an authority, and accordingly do not require to return to the subject. But, besides unduly exalting 'Wood's Douglas,' Mr. Foster goes out of his way to depreciate the value of certain highly important publications. 'Those great Club Societies,' he says, 'the Roxburghe, the Bannatyne, and the Maitland, who might have edited and printed so much valuable material, have practically missed their mark, by catering for the powerful few instead of the majority of the nation.' Such ludicrous and unintelligible criticism is altogether unworthy of notice. The omission of two other important Clubs, the Abbotsford and the Spalding --to say nothing of the absurdity of associating the Roxburghe (which merely printed literary rarities) with the Bannatyne and Maitland Clubs—amply indicates the extent of Mr. Foster's acquaintance with the best sources of genealogical information. With regard to his plea on behalf of 'the majority of the nation,' we have seen how Mr. Foster studies the interests of the British public in his treatment of historical and unimportant families respectively; and we venture to think that more than enough has been said to indicate the leading motive of his *modus operandi*. Unfortunately the 'Peerage' and 'Baronetage' are not the only works compiled by Mr. Foster in which the most inexperienced critic would find little difficulty in detecting serious blemishes. As a single instance we may mention that one of the two fabulous pedigrees already referred to in our notice of Burke's 'Landed Gentry' appears in Mr. Foster's 'Lancashire Families,' published in 1873, eight years after it had been exposed by the author of 'Popular Genealogists.' He is not the only living genealogist who requires to be reminded, in the memorable words of John Riddell, that 'true Genealogy is an austere, stern potentate, governing by unswerving rigid laws, founded on truth only-- knowing that thereby she can alone act with dignity and advantage; and not a reckless, loose nymph or Bacchante, who, in her frolics, gives vent to every flattering tale and fable, to cajole and unduly elevate the credulous for her own profit and the amusement of others, and to sallies of fancy and imagination.'

ART. IX.—1. *L'Ouverture du Fleuve Rouge au Commerce.*
Par J. DUPUIS. Paris: 1879.

2. *Voyage au Yunnan.* Par J. DUPUIS. Paris: 1880.

3. *La Province Chinoise du Yunnan.* Par EMILE ROCHER.
Paris: 1880.

4. *Histoire de l'Intervention Française au Tong-king de 1872–1874.* Par F. ROMANET DU CAILLAUD. Paris: 1880.

5. *Across Chrysê.* By ARCHIBALD R. COLQUHOUN. London: 1883.

6. *The Golden Chersonese.* By ISABELLA BIRD. London: 1883.

NOTHING is more stale and unprofitable than the retrospect of a spent Session. We therefore turn, without regret, from the laborious efforts and factious recriminations of the House of Commons, which scarcely deserve the name of politics, to the consideration of a political question of far more interest to the commercial classes of this country and even to the peace of the world. The measures taken and contemplated by the Government of France with reference to the States and territories contiguous to the French settlement in Cochin China have attracted public attention to one of the least known parts of Asia, and we shall devote the pages we usually assign to political questions nearer home to the consideration of affairs in the Indo-Chinese peninsula. One of the peculiarities of this subject is that very considerable steps have been taken by the French with an imperfect knowledge of the nature of their enterprise. The Government has been extremely reticent, and some of the leading journals of Paris treat the whole matter with a degree of levity and ignorance which is simply inconceivable. Yet several publications of interest have appeared in France on the subject, which we have quoted at the head of this article, and the earliest notices we have of the country are from the French missions.

We need hardly say that we enter upon this discussion with no feelings of jealousy or hostility to France. On the contrary, if she succeeds in introducing civilisation, trade, and peace into the whole Indo-Chinese Peninsula, and in opening a route to South-Western China, Great Britain, which has by far the largest interest in the China trade, would be the principal gainer, as we shall presently show. But we must be permitted to say that the spirit of colonial enterprise in remote parts of the globe, which has recently been manifested by the present

French Government, appears to us to be entirely fictitious; it has no real root in the country; and it has been prompted partly as a compensation for their diminished influence in Europe, and partly as a mode of exciting patriotic enthusiasm for the purposes usually described as 'political capital.' Not one Frenchman in ten thousand cares a rush for the great names of Dupleix, La Bourdonnaye, or Montcalm, or even knows that Napoleon sold to the United States not only Louisiana, but the finest part of the North American continent. The passion which founds colonial empires has no place in the French heart. The idea of expatriation, which is attractive to numbers of our own countrymen, is on the contrary painful and repulsive to the great majority of the French. The *amour du clocher*, as they term it, is one of the strongest and most universal sentiments of the French people. Hence, of all the States of Europe, at the present time, France is least given to foreign emigration and colonial enterprise. The stress produced by the excessive pressure of population in these islands, and in some parts of the continent, is unfelt in France. She has at her gates a vast territory in Northern Africa, to which the migration of the French in fifty years has been extremely small. In point of fact, the impulse which has conducted the French within the last few years to Mexico, to Tunis, to Congo, to Madagascar, and to Tonquin, can be shown to take its rise in the speculations of a few adventurous individuals, who have succeeded in implicating the Government in their private affairs, and have sought to retrieve a personal disaster by a national intervention. When the patriotism of the Chambers is roused by some painful incident, the sense of honour in a high-spirited people prompts them to make sacrifices, which lead to no results; but if the genuine feeling of the French people, and even of the French army, could be ascertained, they would far rather stand aloof from all such hazardous and sterile enterprises which may insensibly draw them into difficulties of the most formidable character, not only abroad but at home. For it deserves to be borne in mind that none of the ephemeral governments which succeed one another in France is strong enough to support a reverse or a disaster. The Government itself collapses under it. The Mexican expedition contributed not a little to the unpopularity and embarrassments of the Second Empire; and the rulers of the Republic may lay their account with this—that whenever the day of reckoning comes, every mistake and every failure will be visited on themselves and on the form of government they wish to uphold.

The French people have been needlessly irritated by random and reckless statements that English interests must suffer from their *success*, and that the attainment of their objects in Tonquin will inevitably be followed by the introduction of their influence into Siam and Burmah, and by the establishment of a rival empire to our own on the borders of China. Such predictions are of the wildest kind, while they argue a strange want of faith in the capacity of this nation to hold its own in the markets and capitals of Asia. Inasmuch as the Treaty of 1874 between France and the King of Anam aimed at toleration and security to Christians, the opening of rivers to foreign trade, and the suppression of piracy, these three points were clearly beneficial to civilisation and humanity. If reliance can be placed on the reports of the French and Spanish Vicars-General of the Province, who are chiefs of the Missions in Anam, and who were both of them opposed to French military intervention, there is no region on the face of the earth worse governed than the territories of King Tudue. The people are crushed by the exactions of the Mandarins; frequent insurrections devastate the country; and the coasts are ravaged by a slave-trade of the most hateful kind, carried on by Chinese pirates. We cannot, therefore, feel the slightest sympathy for so detestable a native government, which is at once weak, corrupt, and tyrannical.

England has no apprehension whatever from French success; the more complete it proved the more would English commerce, and foreign influence as opposed to Chinese exclusiveness, benefit by it. What she does apprehend, and what all those having a stake in the affairs of the far East dread to contemplate, is that France will fail not so much even to carry her point, as to sustain the reputation of European superiority necessary to the maintenance of Asiatic peace. The effort will have to be so great and sustained that even a more determined people than the French might decline to prosecute the undertaking to a successful issue. Moreover the scene of the contest may become so extended, the passions of the Chinese not only against France but against all foreigners must be so inflamed by any hostile collision with a European Power, that the action of the French in Tonquin of which we have to trace the origin and course may entail calamities on Eastern Asia which are now unforeseen. Let us state as plainly as words can in the very commencement of our remarks that it is the possibility of the half-success or the failure of French plans in Anam which inspires us with alarm, and not any idle fear at the

chimerical scheme of their founding another Oriental Empire on the confines of India and China.*

We shall now proceed to describe in some detail the strange origin of this Tonquin question. Our information is derived chiefly from the French works which we have placed at the head of this article, especially from the interesting volume of M. Romanet du Cailland, published in 1880; and we would only observe that if we have occasion to comment with some severity on the conduct of French agents in Tonquin, the language we shall apply to them is not half so strong as that they have applied to one another, and the facts we cite rest on their own evidence and correspondence.

To the readers of this Journal the question of French enterprise and exploration in Indo-China will not come as a new theme. More than ten years ago, when the labours of the Commission for the Exploration of the Mekong had terminated with the discovery that the mighty river of Cambodia was not navigable, and that the fairest dreams of the French in Indo-China could not, therefore, be realised, we called attention to the fact that an expedition was about to start for the Songcoi and to break ground in another direction.† It was indeed the beginning of the Tonquin question in the enterprise of M. Dupuis and the expedition of M. de la Grée and Lieutenant Garnier. But in order to realise the exact position of affairs,

* In the last edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' there is a valuable article on Cochin China from which we extract the following facts, which are of interest at this moment. The extent of the Empire of Anam is about equal to that of France. The population is estimated at ten or twelve millions. The delta of the Songcoi or Nhi-Ha is intersected by numerous channels and canals, of which a curious Chinese map was executed by order of the Emperor Kia-Tsing. It is copied in the 'Lettres Edifiantes.' Hanoi is situated on one of these channels. None of them are deep, and, owing to the vast alluvial deposits of the rivers, the bar at the mouth of the principal entrance has only $5\frac{1}{2}$ feet in winter and 12 feet in summer. The climate of Tonquin, though better than that of Cochin China, is injurious to Europeans. Dysentery and wood-fever prevail. The month of August is the hottest and the most unhealthy in the year. The first treaty of the Annamese with France was concluded in 1787, when she acquired the peninsula of Tourane and the island of Pulo-Condore. In 1862 the Court of Hué ceded three provinces to France, and in 1874 three more, the French finding that their position on the coast at Saigon was absolutely worthless, unless they had access to Cambodia, in the interior of the country.

† See article on Trade Routes to Western China in No. cclxxx. for April, 1873.

and to show the train of circumstances which have made the name of the Red River a household word in Paris, we must go back one step further, and include the journeys to Yunnan of M. Rocher from the one side and of M. Dupuis from the other.

While M. Rocher was an official in the Customs Service of China, M. Dupuis had preserved the independence which better suited his character and plans. He arrived in China at the time of the last foreign war, and after the conclusion of peace established himself in a commercial capacity at Hankow. He there acquired a fluent knowledge of the language, and made that important place of trade the centre for a succession of tours which are said to have extended throughout fifteen of the eighteen provinces of China. He did more than learn how to converse in the official tongue; he succeeded in gaining the confidence of the principal officials. As far back as 1866 he was engaged in the purchase of arms and munitions of war for the Imperial authorities. The outbreak of the Mahomedan or Panthay rebellion in Yunnan rendered the despatch of a supply of arms to the viceroy of that province highly desirable, and the offer of M. Dupuis to undertake the task was gladly accepted. M. Dupuis had been struck by the possibility that the river flowing into the Gulf of Tonquin, which was known to rise within the frontier of Yunnan, might prove sufficiently navigable to afford a short and convenient route to South-West China; and when the results of the Mekong Commission were first made known he resolved to prosecute this enquiry with the least possible delay. He visited Yunnan in 1869, and again in the following year, when he resolved, although the rebellion was still far from being crushed, to return to Hankow through Tonquin. The difficulties of the journey gave a further zest to the enterprise in the eyes of this hardy adventurer, and notwithstanding the warnings of the Chinese authorities he proceeded across Southern Yunnan to the valley of the Songeoi. He succeeded in travelling down that stream to the vicinity of Hanoi, and then returned to Yunnan to report that the navigability of the Red River was a fact beyond dispute. The Chinese authorities still engaged in that province in their struggle with the Mahomedans were naturally much rejoiced at the prospect of receiving a supply of arms by an easy and rapid road from Europe; and they gave M. Dupuis full powers to act as their mandatory, as well as a letter calling upon the officials of Anam as the faithful vassal of China to assist him in every way whenever he should endeavour to convey his stores and arms up the Songeoi into Yunnan. M.

Dupuis, it is true, had then only explored the upper course of that stream, but as no doubt was entertained that the lower portion was open to trading vessels he felt justified in declaring, on his return to Hankow in 1871, not only that the Songcoi was navigable, but that it was about to become an important avenue of trade.

M. Dupuis had thus not only established, to his own satisfaction at all events, the feasibility of the short route into South-West China from the Gulf of Tonquin, but, availing himself of the temporary difficulties of the Chinese authorities in Yunnan, had procured their assent to his bringing them a supply of arms by that route. M. Dupuis redoubled his efforts when he fancied that success was within his grasp, and hastened to France to buy the chassepots and the field artillery which were to enable Marshal Ma to overthrow the truculent despot of Talifoo. It was the autumn of 1872 before this enterprising commercial agent had collected his stores, and obtained the vessels to convey them to the Songcoi. At this point it became necessary to decide whether before starting on his journey M. Dupuis should apprise the Court of Hué of his purpose; and after anxious deliberation it was resolved on the advice of M. Senez that it would be unwise and would really invite failure to take any such step. M. Dupuis was, therefore, to proceed in secret to the Songcoi; and in order that his character as a Chinese mandarin might not be lost sight of, or confounded with that of a French emissary, he was to purchase vessels of his own instead of using the French man-of-war promised him by the Minister of Marine. The expedition was fitted out, M. du Caillaud informs us, at Shanghai and Hongkong; but as it was arranged in the interests and with the sanction of China it excited no opposition and attracted little attention. Yet the squadron mustered in all four vessels with an armed force of twenty-five Europeans and one hundred and fifty Asiatics, principally Chinese; and it may be interesting to add that the supply of arms destined for Marshal Ma consisted of 'thirty field-pieces, six or seven thousand rifles, and between twelve and fifteen tons of material of all descriptions.' M. Dupuis cast anchor off the mouth of the Songcoi on November 8, 1872, when he found that the real difficulties of navigation as well as diplomacy were still before him. Thanks, however, to his own energy and to the cordial support and co-operation of M. Senez, M. Dupuis succeeded in finding a navigable channel leading into the main stream, and in due course anchored his vessels outside Hanoi. The Anamese authorities were taken by surprise, and without instructions from Hué they

were unable to decide their proper course of action. M. Dupuis acted with prudence and determination. He allowed them an interval for the purpose of communicating with King Tudue, and on the expiration of the specified time he procured some native boats through the assistance of his Chinese friends, who were influenced by his position as a mandarin, and by the direct order of a Chinese general named Chen, and having placed his stores in them he continued his journey up the Songcoi, leaving his larger vessels at Hanoi. His vigour paralysed the Anamese, and before they had resolved what to do he had passed beyond the reach of their power.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the enthusiastic reception he met with in Yunnan, which of course loses nothing in the hands of French narrators, or on the numerous commissions for a profitable trade with which he retraced his steps down the Red River. 'The water route through Tonquin had been completely traversed, and its navigability effectually demonstrated,' such was the declaration made by the French explorer on his return. It remained to accomplish the most difficult task of all, to keep it permanently open by disarming the opposition of Anam without wounding the susceptibilities of China. Marshal Ma is reported to have offered to send an army to subdue the valley of the Songcoi, but M. Dupuis rejected the proposition through a patriotic impulse to secure the monopoly of this region for France. Perhaps he also had an intuitive perception that the complaisance of Chinese officials was due to their temporary difficulties, and would prove short-lived when they had passed away. M. Dupuis preferred to rely upon himself and on the support of his own Government, and the successful despatch of a supply of salt after his return to Hanoi led to the expectation that things would gradually settle down and that the trade would continue. What M. Dupuis had been glad enough to obtain as a Chinese official, he was resolved to keep as a commercial agent for himself and the French Government; and it is most necessary to remember this fact, as it supplies the explanation of the change which has taken place in the sentiments of the Chinese since 1872.

While M. Dupuis had been thus busily engaged in demonstrating the navigability of the Songcoi, his friend the naval officer, M. Senez, had drawn up a scheme of policy to make the Court of Hué dependent on France and to give his Government the practical command of the Tonquin delta. The scheme could not be found fault with for want of boldness or comprehensiveness. The King of Anam was to be

compelled to sign a treaty of the closest amity, and six strategical points in the lower course of the Songcoi were to be occupied by the French and garrisoned with a force 'of eighteen companies of marine infantry, six batteries, and twelve mitrailleurs.' In addition to this garrison there was to be a strong naval squadron 'of six despatch boats, eight or ten gunboats, and of from fifteen to eighteen steam launches armed with a four-pounder apiece.' This garrison was more considerable than it might appear, and would have numbered at least five thousand Frenchmen, a force which no French Government has ever contemplated as being permanently required for keeping open a small water-way in a remote region. Indeed, at this very time the then Minister of Marine in Paris had declared that he would not hear of the smallest military occupation of Tonquin. Yet such, on M. Senez's own showing, was the force needed to hold the French position in the country, and he had the lowest opinion of Anamese opposition, and completely ignored that of China. We have given the opinion of M. Senez more prominence than perhaps it intrinsically deserves, because his official report forms the basis of the present action of M. Challemel-Lacour and his colleagues; but as a matter of fact it is hardly worthy of this consideration, for among the proposals made are fanciful suggestions to stir up a rebellion among the Tonquinese and to put arms in their hands, as well as to deport all the officials of Hué to the convict station of Pulo Condore if they raised objections to the carrying out of their plans. But let us resume the thread of events.

The success of M. Dupuis—for notwithstanding the persistent efforts of Anamese diplomacy he remained with his ships anchored off Hanoi, where he purchased from Chinese residents several houses, thus gaining a foothold on land—and the bold schemes of M. Senez induced the Saigon authorities to give the subject close attention; and they were easily persuaded by the deeds and words of these agents that success was to be attained, and that only a slight effort was required to add a vast and flourishing dependency to the French Republic. At this very conjuncture, when the authorities in Cochin China were pondering over the attractive prospect, two circumstances combined to hasten them towards decisive action. The one was the rumoured intention of both Germany and England to interfere in Tonquin, which, we need hardly say, was utterly baseless; the other, the intelligence that a rebellion was about to break out in that country against the authority of King Tuduc. These additional inducements

proved irresistible, and the French hastened to assert themselves for the first time as a Government and in an official way in the affairs of Tonquin. They did not doubt for a moment that where an individual like M. Dupuis had not failed they would achieve complete and enduring success.

The interest in the subject now passes from M. Dupuis to the accredited representatives of France in Indo-China, who in the person of Admiral Dupré resolved to assert their rights on the Songcoi. Two war-vessels were directed to proceed to the scene of the approaching struggle; and as the bad health of M. Senez, to whom the command was first offered, detained him in Europe, the expedition was entrusted to M. Francis Garnier, the most capable and intrepid of the French explorers in that region. With the appointment of Garnier the most brilliant and encouraging period of French action in Indo-China began, but the reader will have little difficulty in perceiving that the success was due solely to the energy of the French commander, and that any expectations of its proving durable could only end in disappointment. Garnier was already known to fame as the author of the official account of the exploration of the Mekong, which had resulted in demonstrating the impossibility of making that great stream a means of communication with the interior. In that work he had taken the opportunity to express some very strong opinions to the effect that French policy had been too long subservient to that of England, and that if the French Government acted with proper discretion it might easily become the most powerful moral force in the Far East and the real arbiter of the destinies of the nations bordering the China seas. Garnier's views were not of a kind to admit of close contact with the hard facts of the position in Cochin China; but it is essential to bear in mind that the policy entrusted to him for realisation was to secure the strong places of Tonquin so that French interests might be preserved during the critical period foreseen to be approaching in Anamese affairs. Garnier was all in favour of proceeding with due deliberation, and he deprecated the open employment of force as calculated to lead to the active intervention of China. His remarks are so instructive on this point that they deserve to be specially recorded.

‘An expedition without an ostensible object will probably cost us unlooked-for interventions. What should we do if, for instance, the Court of Peking were to order, at the request of the Anamese Government, the troops of Yunnan to march down into Tonquin in order to defend it against our invasion? Those troops are armed with tho

rifles and mitrailleurs sold them by M. Dupuis; they have also European instructors. Moreover, if conquest is such an easy matter, administration is a task of difficulty; and we absolutely lack the necessary staff for it. Would it not be preferable, therefore, for us to pose as the champions of the rights of the Hué Court, and to impose upon it, in return for our protectorate, the opening of Tonquin to commerce? We should thus place ourselves in an absolutely unassailable diplomatic position.'

M. Garnier's advice was taken, and his proposed plan of proceedings was followed; but, as will be seen, the accompanying events were not of a kind to insure any satisfactory result for them. Towards the end of October he reached the Songcoi with two gunboats and a small force of marine infantry and artillery under his command, and with *carte blanche* for his instructions. While M. Dupuis had carried his point as the mandatory of China, M. Garnier came in the character of the champion of King Tuduc against refractory subjects and the pirates of the Songcoi. In the prosecution of this new policy it was clearly seen how inconvenient and dangerous the claims of China might become, and all the efforts of the French officials were directed to the task of repelling her pretensions. From this point of view M. Dupuis was a hindrance to their plans, and he would have been repudiated and abandoned had the Chinese attempted to assert themselves in the province by his instrumentality. Indeed an express provision was made for sending him, if necessary, out of the country.

But although M. Garnier came to Tonquin with these amicable intentions in the cause of Tuduc, he met with a very cold reception and found little sympathy on the part of the Anamese officials. Perhaps they knew or surmised that the secret sympathies of the French officers were with the Tonquinese literates then on the eve of rebellion; and they were much more inclined to resent than to welcome the assistance of foreigners in performing their own duties. The French officer laboured under the disadvantage of having throughout a double policy. On the one hand he was to promote the authority of Tuduc, on the other he was to coquette with the aspirations of the people and to do his best to discover some eligible candidate of the old native dynasty to the throne. The French may see in this the proof of an astute policy; but ordinary people will only be disposed to think that they did not know their own mind, or what exactly they were striving for.

The attendant circumstances of this expedition were not

auspicious, for it began with the loss of one of the gunboats. However, Garnier was not the man to be deterred by such an incident, and although he had lost the greater portion of his stores he proceeded towards his destination. On the Songehi canal, which connects two channels of the river and affords the most convenient approach to the capital, he had his first interview with M. Dupuis, who was made to clearly understand that his individual interests must be subordinate to the policy of France, whatever form it might take. M. Garnier then wrote officially: 'M. Dupuis shows himself full of patriotism and good sense, and readily defers to all my instructions.' The reception which awaited M. Garnier at Hanoi was far indeed from being cordial. The authorities hardly deigned to take any notice of his arrival, and it was only after a long delay that a mandarin of low rank appeared to point out the place of residence which had been selected for the French Mission. The house was a wretched inn situated in the centre of the town, unsuitable not less from its position than on account of its meagre accommodation. To the energetic remonstrances of M. Garnier, who forced his way into the citadel, and obtained an audience in person, the Anamese were constrained to yield, and for 'this unsuitable and inconvenient inn' was substituted a large and commodious building outside the town, constructed for the use of the students at the public examinations. A period of uncertainty followed, marked by messages to and from the Songeoi and Hué, but without bringing the relations of France with the Anamese nearer to a satisfactory basis. The French candidly admitted that their main object was to open Tonquin to commerce, and they claimed their right to do so under one of the clauses of the treaty of 1862, which opened the port of Ba-lat to French vessels. But Tuduc's representative disclaimed the power, and certainly did not possess the inclination, to meet the French officer half-way in this matter. It was a question, he said, to be decided at Hué, not at Hanoi. All the tact and energy of M. Garnier fell to the ground in face of the *non possumus* of Tuduc's lieutenants; and as the hostility of the mandarins was daily becoming more openly proclaimed, the French officer resolved to turn to the other side of his instructions and to assert the claims of France in the teeth instead of by the aid of the Anamese. To quote his own words:—

'I have resolved on this striking action. On November 15 I will attack the citadel. I will arrest the Marshal, and send him to Saigon in one of Dupuis' vessels which I will borrow for the occasion. I will then officially proclaim at Hongkong and along the whole coast

of China this country open to commerce, and the customs will supply me with the means of carrying on the government.'

In the course of a few short weeks, French policy had thus veered round from one of friendship towards Anam, to unconcealed and unqualified opposition. The change suited M. Garnier, as it enabled him to see exactly what he had to do, and how to adjust his means towards accomplishing it. There then ensued a brief series of events most satisfactory to the French, and for a short space of time it seemed as if they might attain their object by the conquest of the Tonquin delta. On November 19 Garnier presented an ultimatum, to which no reply being accorded, he resolved to attack the citadel. The force of which he could dispose was limited, consisting of 188 Europeans, 24 Asiatics, and eleven pieces of artillery; but its superiority over the five or six thousand badly armed and inexperienced Anamese in the citadel was obvious and quite incontestable. Early in the morning of the day following the despatch of the ultimatum the assault was delivered, and the resistance encountered was so insignificant that in less than an hour the citadel was in the possession of the French. This prompt result was greatly assisted by the vigorous fire from the gunboats, and by the co-operation of some of M. Dupuis' Chinese soldiers. The French lost not a man, killed or wounded, while the Anamese left two thousand prisoners in their hands, besides eighty killed and three hundred wounded. From so signal a victory it was only natural that the French should expect to draw the greatest possible advantages, and M. Garnier freely gave the rein to his ideas on the subject of a mighty colonial empire for France in Indo-China. The capture of Hanoi was followed by that of Haidzuong and Ninbinh by still smaller naval detachments, while M. Garnier established his quarters in a sacred palace within the citadel, reserved for the exclusive use of the King of Anam, and from which he issued proclamations still declaring that France only wished to establish her protectorate in the interests of that ruler. Since the days of Cortes and Pizarro we do not remember to have heard of a more daring exploit than the capture of these large citadels by a handful of French seamen and marines.

Although M. Garnier's first achievement had been so completely successful and easily obtained, it very soon became clear that the resistance of the Anamese was far from being crushed, and that they were preparing to oppose, after their own fashion, the further operations of France. While M. Garnier was obliged to leave Hanoi in order to attack Namdinh, called by the people 'the neck of Tonquin,' the

scattered Anamese soldiers had assembled in the country beyond the capital, and had enlisted many of the Black Flag Chinese into their service for the express purpose of driving out the French. Namdinh fell into his hands, but not without resistance and some loss to the assailants. The victory was scarcely assured, when alarming news from Hanoi recalled the French commander to the capital. The Anamese garrisons had collected and taken the field, while a still more formidable enemy had appeared in the Black Flags, who were Chinese rebels of the province of Kwangsi driven out by the Imperial commanders at the time of the suppression of the Taeping rebellion, and possessing a military capacity and personal courage far above the untried soldiers of King Tuduc. The success before Namdinh, instead of being decisive, would have, it was seen, to be confirmed by another signal victory; and when Garnier reached Hanoi on December 18, he found the enemy rendered confident by several failures on the part of the French to dislodge them from their position, and his own men correspondingly discouraged and exhausted by much marching and continued fighting. It was imperative to strike an immediate blow; and even the commencement of negotiations for the signature of a treaty of peace with the Court of Hué could not prevent the prosecution of military plans. These proceedings of M. Garnier were strongly disapproved by M. Philastre, who was then in charge of the negotiations at Saigon. On December 6 the following letter was addressed by him to Garnier:—

‘Mon cher Garnier,—Quand j’ai reçu votre lettre, elle m’a jeté dans la plus profonde stupéfaction. Je croyais encore que c’étaient là de vaines menaces. Avez-vous donc songé à la honte qui va rejaillir sur vous et sur nous quand on saura qu’envoyé pour chasser un baratier quelconque, et pour tâcher de vous entendre avec les fonctionnaires anamites, vous vous êtes allié à cet aventurier pour mitrailler sans avis des gens qui ne vous attaquaient pas et qui ne se sont pas défendus? Le mal sera irréparable et pour vous et pour le but que l’on se propose en France.’

When this letter reached Hanoi, Garnier had already paid the penalty of his rashness with his life.

The Anamese garrisons and their Black Flag allies had no inclination to refrain from pushing home their advantage against the foreigners; and their attitude became so menacing that it was only a question of awaiting their attack in the citadel or of going out to engage them. It was on December 21, only thirty-two days after the capture of Hanoi, that the French were called on to defend that citadel against the attack

of the large native force which had gathered from all sides for their destruction. Their efforts were successful, and the local levies were driven back with loss; but when the French assumed in turn the offensive, the Black Flags only retired into the shelter of the bamboo thickets, and made fresh front again. Garnier led in person the van of the pursuers, and, with eighteen men and one four-pounder, he placed himself on the traces of a worsted but savage foe of several thousands. Carried away by his own impetuosity, Garnier led the advance, regardless of obstacles and of the enemy. The gun had soon to be left behind, and several of his men to guard it, while others were detached to protect the flanks and to drive back any scattered bodies of the enemy. When he arrived in front of the principal stockade, where the Black Flags had mustered in force, only three of his men were present to support him, and even these had been outstripped by their active commander. The appearance of the French officer seems to have either so surprised or so terrified the natives that for a moment they meditated flight, but they recovered from their panic, and when Garnier slipped in endeavouring to cross their palisade they stabbed him repeatedly with their spears, and carried off his head as a token of their victory. Too much indignation must not be vented on this barbarous proceeding, as it is the practice in that region, and the native soldiers of M. Dupuis had treated a chief of the Black Flag in precisely the same way only a few days before.

The death of Garnier signified nothing more or less than the failure of the French plans, which he alone understood, and which only his energy rendered at all possible. Garnier possessed in a remarkable degree those qualities of self-reliance and resolute determination which not less than a high order of courage are necessary to the pioneers of commerce and empire in Eastern lands. As he himself used to say, if he had been born an Englishman he would have done good service, and accomplished something that would have endured. But had he been a Clive, he could only act according to his lights for the attainment of a very obscure object with extremely imperfect means, and his courage appears to have been allied to a singular absence of judgment and good faith. Whether they better appreciated the difficulty of the undertaking, or, as Garnier's admirers insist, lacked the nerve to carry it out, his successors set themselves to the task of coming to as satisfactory an arrangement as they could with the Anamese Government, and thought that both the honour and the interests of France would be well served if the evacuation

of the delta could be carried out under cover of a favourable treaty with the Court of Hué.

These new arrangements were entrusted to M. Philastre, who, although rewarded at the time, has ever since been made the object of the indignation of those persons who are interested in the occupation of Tonquin. To him was entrusted the difficult and thankless task of winding up an operation that the French Government of that day had the good sense to see could not be successfully prosecuted with the forces and attention it could spare from more important matters. Such arrangements are best completed with despatch, and in the early part of January, 1874, Ninhbinh, Namdinh, and other places were evacuated by the French, and restored to the Anamese forces. Still more important negotiations were in progress at Saigon, where a treaty of peace was concluded on March 5—*arraché* is the term applied to the transaction by M. du Caillaud—by which Tuduc bound himself to conform his foreign policy to that of France, who in turn recognised that sovereign's complete independence. This instrument, therefore, at one blow repudiated the suzerainty of China, and established the virtual protectorate of France. M. Rheinart was sent to Hanoi as the representative of the Republic, but his term of residence was very brief, and he finally withdrew from the Tonquinese capital in the following June. With his departure, the first active intervention of France in the valley of the Songcoi terminated, and it might have been thought that her experiences were such as to prevent a renewal of the adventure. As M. du Caillaud expresses it, 'our magnificent achievements were annihilated in a few hours, and Tonquin, of which we possessed the fairest provinces, passed again under the abhorred yoke of Hué.'

There was one circumstance in connexion with the retirement of the French which added to the significance of their discomfiture, and which attached a stigma to their name among the natives. The French had, as we have seen, veered from one policy to another, and had shown themselves undecided whether they should support a national rising, or stand by Tuduc and the Government of Anam. Although they adopted the latter course, they went so far in encouraging the Tonquinese to revolt that Garnier's campaign was still in progress when the symptoms of a rebellion revealed themselves in the north-eastern districts of the country. The people proclaimed their intention to restore the family of Li, which had previously held the throne, and they felt so thoroughly convinced of French support that they embroidered their standards with the words

Famille des Lâ. There is no doubt that the French missionaries were the principal agents in stirring up this popular rising, for they saw in the expulsion of the Anamese, and in the restoration of a native dynasty, the last chance not only of advancing the political ends of France, but of insuring the triumph of Christianity.* The insurrectionary movement reached its height during the negotiations of M. Philastre, and it so far promoted the policy of the French that it induced the Hué Government to cast aside its usual procrastination and to hasten the signature of the Treaty of Saigon. The French would not have obtained the favourable terms of that treaty but for the apprehension of the Anamese at the insurrection spreading throughout Tonquin, which compelled the latter to arrange their difficulty with France before the extent and formidable character of this rising were revealed. The French, therefore, distinctly benefited at the time from their coquetting with national aspirations, but the too confiding natives were left to pay the penalty of their trust in their European sympathisers to the vindictive lieutenants of King Tuduc. Nor was this all. The French officers on the Songcoi co-operated with the Anamese in attacking the rebels who had been led to revolt by their specious promises and flattering representations. The awakening of the people from the delusion they had nursed on the subject of French support was rude, but it was effectual; and henceforth they declared that they 'would rather die than trust again to the Frenchmen's treacherous promises.' M. du Caillaud again sums up the situation with a force and eloquence that justify the quotation of his sentences.

'Such was the end of that insurrection, which, if France had even

* Our limits forbid us to enter, on the present occasion, on the very curious early history of the Christian missions to Cochin China and Tonquin; but a full account of them and of the history of Tonquin will be found in the sixteenth volume of the '*Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses*' of the Jesuit fathers, published in Paris in 1721. The mission to Tonquin was for many years one of the most flourishing attempts to propagate the Christian faith. It was founded in 1627 by Father Rhodes and Father Marquez, S.J., who were Portuguese priests. They were aided by the French; and at one time the mission boasted of 200,000 converts, and the number of Anamese Christians is still large. But in 1721 a ferocious persecution broke out, and several of the fathers were cruelly martyred. It also appears from these narratives that the relations subsisting between China and Tonquin have been for the last eight hundred years of the most intimate character, and that the dynasty of Li enjoyed the special protection of the Court of Peking.

only preserved her neutrality, might practically have placed in her hands the protectorate of Tonquin. We fought those very people who proclaimed themselves our allies, working thus after a fashion to be of the greatest possible use to our enemies. And then when the Court of Anam violates unceasingly the treaties and conventions which it has concluded with us, we carry out those very treaties and conventions in the way which will be most unfavourable to our influence. Behold the melancholy result of the policy appropriately inaugurated by the evacuation of the citadels of the delta !'

The evacuation of Tonquin could not purchase the goodwill of the Anamese authorities; but although they chafed at the claims of France, they did not feel able to refuse the ratification of the Treaty of Saigon. The northern province was opened to foreign trade, and very soon European vessels, but very rarely those of France, began to visit the port of Haiphong, which has become the principal centre of the outside trade. But although the trade grew, France neither directly nor indirectly derived any benefit from it, and the following melancholy avowal is wrung from M. du Caillaud himself:—

'Only the Chinese and those having close commercial relations with them have benefited by the opening of Tonquin. There is no French commerce there at all. During the nine months following September 15, 1875, the harbour of Haiphong received English ships, German ships, and Chinese ships, but not a single French vessel. Moreover, notwithstanding the privileges with which Saigon is invested by the Treaty of Commerce, the merchandise imported from that harbour into Tonquin does not exceed for that period the insignificant sum of 23,800 francs, whilst that imported from China, from Hongkong principally, was one hundred and forty-one times greater, and amounted to a sum of nearly three and a half millions of francs. And with regard to the export trade of Tonquin, Saigon has had a still smaller share; it did not receive at that period a single piastre of merchandise from that State, the exports of which, valued at two million francs, were all destined for Hongkong and China. These results were certainly not those we promised ourselves from the opening of Tonquin to commerce.'

Meanwhile the fortunes of M. Dupuis, the discoverer of the Songcoi route and the real author of the French interference in Tonquin, had been reduced to the lowest ebb by the change in the policy of his Government. In the days of his prosperity, when he had a fleet riding on the Songcoi, when he possessed more or less the goodwill of the Chinese, and when he felt confident that France was going to carry out a great mission in Indo-China, M. Dupuis had advanced a claim against the Anamese authorities for an indemnity of ten thousand taels,

more than three thousand pounds sterling, for each month that he was delayed in his commercial operations. His claim against the lieutenants of Tuduc rose by leaps and bounds; and, according to his own statement, it sprang in some incomprehensible manner from two to five hundred thousand taels, an enormous sum, considering the small extent of the trade of Tonquin and the very limited capabilities of M. Dupuis as a commercial agent. Of this sum he never received a fraction, and when summarily ordered by Admiral Dupré to leave Tonquin in 1874 his ships and stores were seized to defray the charges and demands of the crews. M. Dupuis returned to Paris a ruined man, but he has ever since been engaged in impressing his wrongs on those in power; and in January, 1880, he had the satisfaction of receiving a favourable communication from a Commission of the Chamber which had reported on his case, that he had ‘an undoubted claim on the Governments both of France and of Anam.’ The claims of M. Dupuis for compensation supplied a convenient theme for asserting the moral rights of France, and enabled her to bring the greater pressure to bear on the Court of Hué; but it is only fair to state that M. Dupuis derived no personal benefit from the prominence again given to his harsh treatment and misfortunes in the official utterances of the Government. The unsatisfactory reports from the consuls at Haiphong and Hanoi, the stagnation of French trade, and the continued persecution of the Christians in Tonquin, all served to direct increased attention to the subject, and to make it clearer than ever either that the French plans must be abandoned or that some vigorous step should be taken to give them effect.

In 1881, therefore, Captain Rivière was sent as Commandant-General to carry out, by the show if not by the employment of force, the policy which M. de Kergaradec had been unable to realise. He, too, was to act, like Garnier, in the name of Tuduc, to which course indeed France was doubly bound by her own protestations as well as by the treaty of 1874; but he was also instructed to do everything in his power to strengthen and encourage ‘the natural sympathy of the people of Tonquin for France.’ Captain Rivière arrived at the scene of his labours with these ideas impressed upon him, that the Anamese Government was as weak as it was perfidious, and that the Tonquinese were filled with a desire to place themselves under the protection of France. He had also to carry out the stipulations of the Treaty of Saigon, which was to give effect to the sovereignty of King Tuduc as against all opponents whatsoever. But on his arrival he was

brought face to face with the realities of the question, and the first things he had to admit were that, while whatever popular sympathy may have existed had vanished, the Anamese officials were united in their determination to resist the patronage and to thwart the proceedings of the French. Their sentiments were tersely expressed by the Governor of Nam-dinh, who replied to Captain Rivière's summons with, 'Why do you come here? If you want to fight, let us fight; otherwise stay away.' Captain Rivière tried negotiation in order to obtain a foothold at Hanoi, but he was soon compelled to resort to force, and the incidents of his campaign almost exactly resemble those of Garnier's. Like his predecessor he had to storm the citadel of that town, like him also he had to seize by force the other places of the delta, and like him he perished in a skirmish outside Hanoi when endeavouring to disperse the gathered forces of Anam and Tonquin.

Having now traced the course of events in Tonquin from the period of the first intervention of France there to the disaster last April, we have next to consider what objects the French have before them, and how they propose to reward themselves for so many labours undertaken without any definite purpose or careful calculation. There remains also the most important point of all, whether the French possess the means or the method to attain their objects, and to make their protectorate over Anam a reality in face of the combined opposition of that State and of China. French writers find it so impossible to separate the facts from their fancies, that the same writer tells us precisely opposite tales on different pages. The name of the French is admitted to have become synonymous in the minds of the natives with falseness and the cowardly abandonment of their cause: yet in the following paragraphs even the most intelligent of their writers record a series of hopes and expectations in flat contradiction with the facts they have already admitted. 'While restoring the Li dynasty to Tonquin, France will leave it only the honours of royalty, and reserve for herself its power, thus imitating English policy towards the rajahs of India. All military authority especially ought to be reserved in her hands. With such precaution a greater number of French soldiers would not be required to guard both Lower Cochin China and Tonquin than the former alone. Troops raised in Tonquin itself, and formed partly of the Muong mountaineers and partly of Anamese, could be sent to occupy the colony of Saigon; while the greater number of our own troops would be stationed in the more salubrious climate of Tonquin.'

Such are the hopes which even the increasing bitterness of popular animosity, and the necessity to send six thousand French troops from Europe, have not dispelled; and on which it is expected to rear in Indo-China that empire which Dupleix failed to establish in Hindostan. No doubt also is experienced as to the enormous natural wealth of both Yunnan and Tonquin. Latent and available resources are identical in the eyes of French exploiters; and in this new El Dorado, French merchants are only to ask and to have. Here again the facts and the theories are in flat contradiction. The small trade that has sprung up since the ratification of the commercial treaty in 1875 has passed through the hands not of Frenchmen, but of Englishmen, Germans, and Chinese. It is instructive to remember that very much the same thing was said of Saigon twenty-two years ago, when Lower Cochinchina was annexed to the French dominions, as is said to-day of Tonquin. It was only after much deliberation that the territory at the mouth of the Mekong was selected as the site of the new Imperial Colony in preference to Tonquin; but Admiral de la Grandière thought 'that he could attract to Saigon, a city laid out for half a million inhabitants, the important commerce which is carried on by caravans between Laos, Burmah, Tibet, and the western provinces of the Chinese Empire.' Saigon was, therefore, to check the nascent prosperity of Rangoon, and to rival the commercial activity of Hongkong and Singapore; and there were just as good grounds for predicting this as there are now for prognosticating a great future for a French colony in Tonquin. But what are the facts in connexion with the development and present condition of Saigon, which has enjoyed during twenty years every possible advantage that the direct encouragement and patronage of the Government could secure for it? The trade amounts in the aggregate to four millions sterling, and the principal export is rice, while the requirements of the garrison and European community represent a very large proportion of the imports. France herself only takes one-tenth of the exports, supplying in return one-seventh of the imports; the bulk of the trade being in the hands of the English and Chinese. These facts cannot be expected to be palatable to our neighbours, but they are true and cannot be altered. There is no reason why the same course of events should not be repeated under precisely the same circumstances in Tonquin should the French succeed in holding their ground there. The Paris authorities would do well to listen to the counsel of men of experience and calm judgment on this subject, instead of to the sanguine views of

men who have staked their fortunes on the commercial future of the Songcoi route. Were they to do this, they would turn to the reports of men like M. Dierx, President of the Chamber of Commerce at Saigon, who declared that 'in that French colony French commerce was without a present and without a future'—a despairing statement which is borne out by that observant and amusing traveller, Miss Bird, in her latest book of travels. On her way from Hongkong to the 'Golden Chersonese,' this lady landed for a day at Saigon and explored the place.

'On my weary way I was overtaken by a young French artillery officer, who walked with me till we came upon an empty gharrie, and was eloquent upon the miseries of Saigon. It is a very important military station, and a sort of depot for the convicts who are sent to the (comparatively) adjacent settlement of New Caledonia. A large force of infantry and artillery is always in barracks here, but it is a most sickly station. At times 40 per cent. of this force is in hospital from climatic diseases, and the number of men invalided home by every mail steamer, and the frequent changes necessary, make Saigon a very costly post. The French don't appear to be successful colonists. . . . I do not envy the French their colony. According to my informants Europeans cannot be acclimatised, and most of the children born of white parents die shortly after birth. The shores of the sea and of the rivers are scourged by severe intermittent fevers, and the whole of the colony by dysentery, which among Europeans is particularly fatal.'

Such being the undoubted facts in connexion with the condition of Saigon, it becomes the more instructive to consider how far the present hopes of the French with regard to Tonquin are similar to the equally confident anticipations of Admiral de la Grandière on the subject of Saigon. In the first place it is anticipated that the delta of the Songcoi will prove a more salubrious station for Europeans than the estuary of the Mekong, but even in this respect it is only a question of degrees of insalubrity between the two places. Then there is the enormous mineral and agricultural wealth of Tonquin, which is the chief granary of Anam, as well as the centre of vast coal-fields long coveted by the Chinese. More than all, there is the short and convenient water route by the Red River into Yunnan and South-West China. M. Dupuis is content to make assertions on these points, and therefore his statements neither carry conviction nor lend themselves to quotation. M. Rocher, however, gives a very full and interesting description of that part of the great province of Yunnan which would be chiefly affected by the opening of the Songcoi route to commerce; and his statements command the more consideration as he shows throughout his volumes that he does not despise local difficul-

ties or overlook the low condition to which Yunnan has been reduced by the bitter and protracted civil war which only terminated ten years ago. It is significant to compare the statements of this traveller and those of Mr. Colquhoun on the subject of the two routes by the Songcoi and the Sikiang.

‘Manhao, situated on the left bank of the river at the foot of the mountain Wang-tai-pu, has no administrative importance whatever; but it is there that the further transit of the merchandise is arranged both for inland traffic and for the sea. At the time of our passing through it, there were not more than fifty families present, of whom two-thirds were natives and the rest came from Yunnan or other provinces. Established in the place for a long time, they represent business houses of Hongkong, Canton, or Macao. A great part of the village is occupied by large sheds, where the merchandise is stored prior to being sent to its destination. From the establishments and organisation which even now exist, the great commercial activity and the large business transactions formerly carried on, when this trade route was perfectly free and open, may be inferred. Since the interruption in navigation, commerce, having no outlet in this direction, has betaken itself to some extent to the Canton river, so that many established houses here have been compelled to suspend their operations.’

Mr. Colquhoun came to the exactly opposite conclusion, that trade had been diverted from its natural channel by the Sikiang to the Songcoi, but as he wrote ten years later it is probable that the experience of the English traveller confirms the accuracy of what the French writer stated. Mr. Colquhoun in the main bears out what M. Rocher says about the extraordinary mineral wealth of Yunnan, although he is disposed to contradict what that gentleman has written about the agricultural fertility of its eastern districts, and to assume that the really productive portion of the province is that lying nearest to the Burmese frontier. The main point is to ascertain the opinion of the latest traveller on the subject of the resources of Yunnan.

‘The only accounts that we have had of the province, with the exception of that of the French expedition, have been from journeys through the northern region, which is a poor and sterile country, where the character of the country and people is greatly inferior to that of the south.’

It is rather strange that Mr. Colquhoun should so completely ignore M. Rocher, whose volumes give us a very graphic account of the province of Yunnan, probably the best we possess in any language.

‘In the north the province is wild, broken, and almost uninhabitable, on account of the heavy mists, fogs, and rains. In the tangle of mountains there are few valleys to arrest the eye. The population is

wretchedly poor and sparse, living chiefly on maize—for the country is too mountainous for the production of rice. Maize is the ordinary food, rice an article of luxury. Other cereals are cultivated in small quantities. Tea and tobacco of the poorest quality are found here and there. There is no commerce or industry.'

Mr. Colquhoun then draws a glowing picture of the south and south-west, which at one place he describes as 'rich and 'as a rule thickly populated;' but his own experiences of it, as he records them, were widely different, and the valley which he calls the richest district in Yunnan was, when he passed through it, a plague-stricken and deserted plain. Our present purpose, however, is not to pick holes in Mr. Colquhoun's statements and theories, which would not be a very difficult task, but to quote his evidence as a contrast to the accounts of French travellers. The probable truth is, that the exportable wealth of Yunnan is solely mineral, which is at present barely developed, and which can never become a profitable industry to any large extent until the internal means of communication in this province have been vastly improved, or until the Chinese officials cordially consent to the mines being worked, as well as to an active trade across the frontier. Neither Yunnan nor Tonquin is a country where any large trade can be created without corresponding outlay and patience, over and above the unknown point of whether it is possible, on any terms, to obtain the assent of the Peking Government. The French altogether overlook the fact that even M. Dupuis never had any direct relations with the Central Government. He received his instructions and authority from its embarrassed lieutenant against the Mahomedans, the so-called Marshal Ma, who was moreover a renegade Mussulman himself. If, therefore, the French contemplate prosecuting this enterprise because they believe that there is another India to be won in the border lands of China and our Eastern Empire, they are really pursuing a chimera. Tonquin itself might be a more paying, although a far less peaceable, colony than Saigon; but it would have to be that in a very large degree to defray the cost of an increased garrison and of a heavier responsibility.

The radical fault of the French policy in Tonquin and in similar matters of colonial enterprise is, that they start on the assumption that trade will follow in the wake of territorial acquisition and State interference. Our neighbours expect that by constructing a colonial empire to order, they will succeed in procuring profitable markets for their home products; and although repeatedly disappointed, they seem to possess

such an inexhaustible supply of hope that they go on anticipating in the old way. But the only good work Governments can do is to follow in the track marked out for them by commerce; and whatever the French may succeed in accomplishing in Tonquin, it will not be their merchants and manufacturers who will benefit by it, but those of England, China, and Germany. The known facts speak for themselves; and were the French to resort to a policy of protection, they would only exclude other traders at the price of effecting the ruin of their possessions, which are kept alive by the commercial enterprise of other nations. The more enlightened French writers are in their calmer moments not blind to this fact, and nothing can be nearer the truth than the following admissions of M. du Caillaud:—

‘Is there really any cause to feel astonished at there being, practically speaking, no French commerce in our possessions in Indo-China? At Saigon the greater number of French merchants are the official contractors; all the higher branches of commerce are in the hands of the Chinese. In Tonquin, as we have just seen, it is through Hongkong that the greater part of the imports come, and it is also to that port that the principal exports are directed. Hongkong has also from the first been connected with Tonquin by a regular line of steamers. Certainly one would have supposed that the treaty of March 15, 1874, was intended to protect the extension of French trade towards Tonquin and Central China. But the only Frenchman (Dupuis) who, from his position and experience, was in a way to profit by it, and to cause his country to immediately profit by it, has been crushed and ruined. If ever the route of Tonquin acquires the importance which it ought to have, it will be Hongkong that will benefit by it; it is on that English town, and not on our colony in Saigon, that the trade with the interior of China will pivot. *A nous la dépense, aux autres le profit!*’

But while it is important, in order to understand the present position of this question, and to have some idea of how much wider this complication will yet spread unless it be summarily checked, to know the course and the motives of French policy in Indo-China, those facts are of minor importance in comparison with the probable action of the Chinese Government in face of French aggression in one of the emperor's dependencies. The first point of which it is necessary to feel convinced is, that Anam is a dependant of China, and that its vassalage is a substantial fact and not a figment of the imagination. In support of this there are the tribute embassies every four years, duly recorded with all their proceedings and accompanying ceremonies in the pages of the ‘*Pekin Gazette*,’ and the investiture of the sovereign on his accession to the

throne by Imperial Commission. The latter event took place in 1847, on the occasion of Tuduc coming to the throne, but that is so long ago that it appears to be forgotten. There is no similar excuse for overlooking the former fact, as there is resident at Tientsin at this very moment a special embassy from Hué, charged with the task of imploring the protection of the Pekin Government against the aggression of France. A number of competent authorities have expressed opinions on the subject; but perhaps the statement that will carry most weight is that of M. Dupuis himself.

‘The suzerainty of China over Anam has been disputed in these later days. The right exists beyond doubt and question; the investiture was granted by the Court of Pekin at the accession of the last sovereign of Anam, Tuduc, just as it was at the accession of the preceding sovereigns. The details of the ceremony have been preserved by M. Pellegrin, who records how the Anamese sovereign made five salutations to the missive containing the emperor’s good wishes and notice of investiture.’

There is, therefore, not the shadow of a doubt that the dependence of Anam on China exists as a fact; it is claimed by Pekin and admitted at Hué. The important consequence follows from this, that the Chinese Government has a right to a voice in all questions affecting the political status of Tuduc’s dominions, and France can therefore only sever the tie connecting these two States at the risk of incurring the mortal enmity of the Chinese. We have seen how in the first place French policy sought to avail itself of the moral influence of China in order to force the Anamese to open the Songcoi route to trade; but it very soon became clear to the French officials that the Chinese were not to be bought off, and that the endeavour to make a cat’s-paw of them would only result in increasing their influence, and in giving fresh effect to their authority. When M. Dupuis recounted the difficulties he had experienced in conveying his supply of arms up the Songcoi, Marshal Ma at once proposed to send an army to occupy the course of the river down to the sea. The extension of the Chinese Empire could be advantageous to neither the commercial nor the political aims of France, and M. Dupuis enjoys the credit of obeying a patriotic impulse when he declined a proposition that might have benefited himself.

If the French began by using the moral advantages of an alliance and complete agreement with the Chinese, they very soon conceived it to be part of their policy, first to overlook, and then to deny the suzerain rights of China. The treaty of 1874, which was either obtained from the ignorance of the Anamese

commissioners of its significance, or from the embarrassments of Tuduc owing to the rebellion in Tonquin, sought to annihilate at a stroke the rights which China has acquired from antiquity, and which she has preserved with the most scrupulous care and exactitude. The second article of that treaty recognised 'the sovereign rights of the King of Anam, and 'his complete independence of every foreign power whatsoever.' Admiral Dupré boasted that this clause extinguished the suzerainty of China over the country. But that was not the view taken at Peking. The treaty was not communicated to the Chinese Government until the following year. On June 10, 1875, China protested and declared, as she has never ceased to declare, that she refused to recognise a treaty which infringed upon her rights and authority over a vassal state; and this protest was emphatically repeated by the Marquis Tseng in 1881 and 1882. But if the French thought by this stroke of diplomacy to put an end to the connexion with China, Tuduc either did not read it in that light, or failed to act upon it. Certainly the tribute missions to Peking continued to be sent with regularity and at the proper seasons; and there was nothing to show the Chinese Ministers of State that a European Government had absorbed one of the vassal states of the empire, or that it sought to arrogate to itself the privileges of the Dragon Throne. But when Captain Rivière attacked and stormed Hanoi, in April 1882, there was no longer any possibility of concealing the fact, that the French were determined *vi et armis* to establish their authority in the Tonquin delta at the expense of the sovereignty of Anam and the historic claims of China. Whatever euphemisms might continue to be employed, the successful development of their policy would mean nothing short of the effacement of Tuduc's Government. It was at this stage of the question that the progress of the French expedition began to attract attention in China, and that enquiries were set on foot to ascertain for the information of the Peking Government what France was doing in its dependency on the southern borders.

While the progress of French arms attracted the attention of Chinese statesmen, it also aroused Tuduc to the danger of his authority being annihilated, and in consequence he addressed a letter of supplication to Peking for support in resisting the pretensions of France. There is as little room for doubt on the point that Tuduc had the right to make this demand on the Chinese ruler, as there is that the latter can claim the vassalage of Anam; and in the document referred to, Tuduc lays stress on the long-standing and unvarying fidelity of his

family to its engagements. There is no reason to suppose that the emperor's advisers, who have always insisted on the faithful observance of their engagements by the tributary kingdoms, will so far set precedent at defiance and escape responsibility by refusing to perform their part of the contract, and sanction the turning of a deaf ear to the prayers of a dependant in distress. Were they to do so, were they even to allow such prudential considerations to throw a doubt on their capacity to successfully resist a powerful aggressor, to interfere with the discharge of what is clearly their obvious duty, there would be an end not merely to the suzerainty of China, but to the whole system which preserves that empire from disintegration. The Chinese have been able to retain the privileges of past greatness, and to wield a fascinating influence over their neighbours, because they have never allowed any timid diffidence as to their power to make their action hesitating and to mar the consistency of their political pretensions. There have been times within the last generation when the most intelligent and well-disposed foreign observer abandoned hope as to either the existence or the integrity of the Middle Kingdom surviving a combination of storms and disasters without parallel in history. But even at the worst stage of that accumulation of internal commotion and popular sedition, there was no abatement in the proud claims of the Dragon Throne. If rebellion was successful throughout three-fourths of the empire, there was still in the capital, in the undeviating lines of the Imperial system which, apart from all question of the dynasty, would continue to exist and to be handed down like the undying spirit of the Lamas of Tibet, the same fixity of purpose, the same wide-reaching and comprehensive claims to supremacy among the states of Eastern Asia as there were at the happiest and most prosperous era of its history. The storms have now passed away, and the danger has been weathered without even a change of dynasty. The people are as contented as any Asiatic people can be, and China has no danger to apprehend within the wide-stretching dominions which are only limited by those of England and Russia. Is there the least reason to suppose that at a moment of conscious strength and of visible achievement she will be inclined to waive any of those claims which she refused to abate in the worst hour of peril, or at the lowest extremity of embarrassment? Yet, unless she is prepared to abate them, there is the absolute certainty that the prosecution of French plans in Tonquin can only result in a hostile collision between France and China.

The Chinese have to regard this application from Hué not

only as it affects Tonquin, but as a question directly concerning their relations with every vassal which has hitherto reposed in absolute trust on their power and fortitude. If they abandon Tuduc at the pinch, if, when it comes to their turn to justify the trust placed in their honour and sympathy for centuries, they turn a deaf ear to the entreaties of faithful allies in an emergency, and reply, after the cynical fashion of the age, that the cost would be too much, and that Anam must shift for itself, then there is not only an end to the lofty pretensions and unlimited rights of China, but the whole fabric of her majesty and power falls to the ground. The more clearly the consequences to China are realised of her policy in Tonquin proving either unworthy of the past or indifferent to the duty of the present, the more readily will it be perceived and admitted that there is not the least intention at Peking to fail in preserving the national fame, or in rendering effectual aid to the sovereign of Anam. And this is really quite independent of what Li Hung Chang may do or the Marquis Tseng may say; for if it were only a matter of individual opinion and action, there might be the same vacillation in decision or half-heartedness in execution which mars the policy of other nations. In China we have to deal with a system based on unvarying principles, and carried out on lines that admit as little the modification of individual character as of the progress of time. It is at once the strength and the weakness of China; but it at all events enables us to say, if we only look the plain facts fairly in the face, that the action of the Chinese will be in consonance with the traditions of the State and people. They will not even so much as entertain the idea of refusing the application of Tuduc. The doubt as to whether they possess the power to check the progress of France will only be felt by their European friends. It is a question of the simplest and most obvious duty; and no great empire can possibly continue to exist if on every occasion that it has to take a decisive step it counts up the cost of action with trembling, and looks round anxiously to see whether there may not be some safer and less troublesome alternative. The Chinese are the most ancient civilised people in the world, but they have not yet learnt the extreme civilisation of the Lower Empire, which subsidised its foes and abandoned its friends. It is as certain as anything in human affairs can be, that however slow the Chinese may be to take action, they will show themselves implacably and persistently hostile to any scheme of French policy which would inflict an injury on Anam, and cast a slur on the dignity of the Middle Kingdom.

Our neighbours have only to bestow a little thought on the subject to realise the facts for themselves; and they will perceive that the greater the natural advantages of Tonquin, the more admirable the Songcoi may prove as a means of communication, the greater must be the objection of China to the supersession of her authority in Anam. The Chinese have evinced the most remarkable determination in prosecuting their claims and in attaining their ends on occasions when no prospect of practical advantage could have lured them on to dangerous enterprises and remote undertakings. It would be difficult to say in what way China is the better from those campaigns which resulted in the reconquest of Kashgar and Kuldja, and which placed her in the path of Russian progress. If she had only taken into consideration the difficulty and expense of garrisoning distant possessions, she would have rested satisfied with the extermination of the Mahomedan rebels of Kansuh, and Tso Tsung Tang would have stayed the march of his legions at Suchow. But the Chinese prosecuted to the bitter end a policy that many will think unwise and unprofitable. They returned to Central Asia, not because they had drawn great advantages from its possession, but because they had been expelled from it with every circumstance of disaster and ignominy, and because it is part of their historic policy to push the landmarks of the empire to as great a distance as is possible from its heart.

While there is no room for uncertainty on the subject of China's policy, it is a different matter to say in what exact form it will work for the protection of Anam, or how it will endeavour to thwart French plans of aggrandisement. The Chinese do not desire war with France of all countries in particular, and Li Hung Chang is averse to any foreign war whatever; but, although the newspapers appear to think so, Li Hung Chang and Chinese policy are not convertible terms. His experience and influence will insure for negotiation a fair chance of success; they can do no more. The French pretend to act in the interests of King Tuduc; they will be expected to show that the bombardment of his fortresses and the slaughtering of his troops are calculated to promote them. If the treaty of 1874 is the authority under which the French Government claim to proceed, then they will necessarily be expected to abide by its stipulations, although they will be required to admit that China does not come under the category of 'a foreign power.' Whatever action they may wish to take on the Songcoi will have to be with the assent and co-operation of the Anamese Court; and if that agreement is not to be attained, then it will naturally follow that the enterprise must be either

dropped or prosecuted in the light of day as an act of conquest. The French are of course irritated at their want of success, which the death of Captain Rivière notified to the world, and it is only natural that they should wish to avenge that gallant officer, and retrieve the credit of their arms. But they still proclaim their wish to keep within the limits of the Treaty of Saigon, with the important reservation that at present they are inclined to regard China in the category of other foreign powers, and as having no right to intervene between them and the Hué Government. There is, no doubt, an important difference of principle in this; but, seeing the irrefragable evidence on which Chinese suzerainty rests, it is clearly a matter for negotiation, and one in which the good offices of a third Power might go far to procure a satisfactory arrangement. But it must in any case be recollected that mediation which fails to secure the rights of China will be repudiated at Peking and ignored on the frontier of Yunnan. Until the utility of negotiation has plainly passed away, the Chinese Government will certainly hope for a peaceful issue. They have no interest to serve by embarking upon a foreign war precipitately, and with France least of all countries. But the moment it becomes clear that the French intend to prosecute their plans regardless of consequences, and, it must be added, of right, then the question will leave the domain of negotiation for that of vigorous action.

The policy of France is very far from having the clearness of form and the definiteness of purpose that are so eminently characteristic of that of China. 'If we only knew our own mind, everything would be possible,' wrote poor Henri Rivière; but that is exactly what the French do not know. At one moment they are altogether in favour of acting through Tudue, at another of stirring up his subjects and supplying them with arms. One day they only ask for the opening of a river and its ports to enable more enterprising nations to dispose of their productions, and to tap a new region; the next day they must have a great Oriental empire from which every other European shall be rigorously excluded. The objects of their policy change like the views of a kaleidoscope; and their infirmity of purpose is matched by the inadequacy of their means. A large state with a population of more than ten millions is to be permanently subdued by a few hundred men; and a few thousand more are to render success a matter of certainty, and to completely dispose of all the forces of the Chinese Empire! The forgetfulness shown by the French authorities, not of what Englishmen have said, but of what their own countrymen, such as Garnier and Dupuis, have

written on the subject of the military improvements effected by China within the last twenty years, produces a sense of bewilderment as to whether France really contemplates any serious measures in Indo-China or not. But assuming that the French mean to make some further effort towards carrying out their project before resigning it as unattainable, then they will have to be prepared to send out a great many more troops than even the six thousand men that should by this have been collected in one part or other of the dominions of Anam, and to spend a great deal more treasure than the Government has yet had the courage to ask for from the Chamber. If the French people will only consider the plain facts, and realise that continued interference in Tonquin means sooner or later war with China, then there is still every reason to believe that even at this eleventh hour they will hold back from a thankless task, and recognise that the death of Henri Rivière is not the justification for prosecuting a foolish policy, but the token that a great nation should abandon an unwise undertaking and devote all its attention to those matters which are its immediate concern, and which promise to be profitable and advantageous to the people.

The only sound principle on which a Government can proceed is to confine its action to following in the track of the commerce created by the independent efforts of its citizens. The French have sought to procure a great trade by reversing the process, and they have imagined that in order to secure flourishing colonies they have only to erect the tricolour and station a garrison in some conquered region. Over and over again this view has been shown to be mistaken, but the French system remains comparatively unaltered. In Tonquin, as has been the case in Saigon, if they even succeed in carrying out their project it will only be to benefit the trade of Hongkong. They have no trade in Indo-China to foster, and any attempt to establish one by military expeditions will only fail as signally as it has failed before. So far as the local interests are concerned, any further extension of French authority and influence can only have the effect of enlarging the market for English goods, and of increasing the freights for English shippers; and if the French could carry out their plans without provoking war with China, there would be nothing for us to say against their proceedings, however short-sighted they might seem to us. We have certainly no reason to feel either alarm or jealousy at the measures of the French in themselves; and if it were only a question between them and Anam, we should not be bound to criticise in any detail the policy or its accompanying measures.

But it is quite different when there is the strong probability that the policy which France has set on foot in Tonquin can only be continued at the cost of a war with China. It is said in Paris that the easy way to put an end to Chinese opposition and to bring the Celestial Government to reason is to send an expedition to Peking, and to establish a blockade on the coasts. That is to say, that the French believe they have the power in the event of war to put an end to all foreign intercourse with China for the time being, and moreover that they would not scruple to employ it in order to establish their supremacy on the Songhai. A foreign expedition to Peking means the interruption of all commercial intercourse between the people of China and Europeans, and it could not be carried out without reviving the antagonism which has happily slumbered for twenty years. The sufferers from this would not be the French, for their trade with China is extremely small, but the people of this country and the citizens of the United States. It is we who have solid interests at stake, and who must suffer from the effects of the disturbance which an unjustifiable act of aggression on the part of the Republic seems likely to create throughout Eastern Asia. The most superficial acquaintance with the conditions of the China trade ought to show that we should be bound in the interests of humanity, as well as of commerce, to insist on the war being localised and fought out in Tonquin itself.

We cannot better close this paper than by devoting our concluding remarks to the probable form the action of China will take, and to her capacity to wage a war on a comparatively large scale. The object being the defence of Anam, it follows that the most efficient resistance can be made by the native levies if supplied with proper weapons. They have the inestimable advantages of being acclimatised, and of knowing thoroughly the scene of hostilities. It is evident that the Anamese troops are much better armed now than they were when first attacked by the French, while the Black and Yellow Flags have taken service under Tuduc's representatives. It only needs the expression of the sanction of the viceroys of the Two Kwang and of Yunnan to induce those very Muong mountaineers, on whose aid the French counted so freely, to take service against the invaders of Tonquin. The French have not yet shown such a capacity for vanquishing the local difficulties, as to leave it a matter of certainty that they will succeed in crushing the resistance which the forces of Tuduc and the inhabitants of Tonquin are capable of offering. Their arrangements have been so badly made, the arrival of their

reinforcements has been so irregular, and their action so spasmodic, that they have inspired their opponents with fresh confidence, and led them to believe that the failure of the European attack is not impossible. Yet this is without China having moved a single man to the aid of King Tuduc, or without her having made any proclamation of policy or announcement as to the course she will pursue. If without the least external assistance they have managed to make so good a fight of it in positions where the French had many advantages in their favour, what may they not succeed in doing when the French have to advance further into the country, not only against them, but in face of a Chinese army also?

It is quite clear that Tonquin can be best defended in the valley of the Songcoi, and China might be able to afford the enemies of France all the assistance they require without making any declaration of war, or committing any overt act of hostility. Certainly her armies will be directed to the scene of contest by land when the time comes for decisive measures, although the journey for those sent from the north might be simplified and shortened by using the North China Company's steamers from Tientsin or Shanghai to Canton or Pakhoi. But as they have done before, the Chinese will pour their troops into Tonquin from the adjacent provinces of Yunnan and Kwangsi, and they can easily occupy the whole of Northern Tonquin down to the Songcoi itself. In this region, which is very productive and could sustain an army for an indefinite period, they would patiently wait until the French committed some blunder, or until they grew tired of keeping a large army inactive in the East. We have very little doubt that the diplomacy of the representatives of China in Europe and the policy of the Imperial Government will be quite equal to the emergency. The language of Marquis Tseng, as far as it is known, has been explicit, dignified, and pacific. It is obvious that China will play a "waiting game," that she will use no language to irritate the French, and that she will abstain from interference as long as possible. The further the French advance from their base on the sea, the greater will their difficulties become. But the French garrisons on the Songcoi must at all times be exposed to attacks from their powerful neighbours, and the invasion of Tonquin may eventually bring down on the country forces which it would not be easy to resist without the presence of a large European army.

As we close these pages an event of so much historical interest, and of so much political importance to the French

nation, seems to be about to take place, that we are led to offer a few remarks upon it. With the close of the life of Henri-Dieudonné, Duc de Bordeaux and Comte de Chambord, the male line of the elder branch of the Royal Family of France, descending from Louis XIV., expires. The only direct legitimate descendants of that monarch are the Spanish and Italian Bourbons; but as these princes have renounced for nearly two centuries their national character as Frenchmen, and have acquired that of foreign sovereigns, these branches are severed from the Royal line of France by their history and by the operation of law, as completely as by the solemn declarations of their ancestors which were annexed to the Treaty of Utrecht. The law of France expressly excludes from French nationality those who have acquired the nationality of another country, and the first condition of the status of a French prince is that he should be a Frenchman. It is evident, therefore, that if any pretensions to the rank and status of French princes are put forward on their behalf by the enthusiastic partisans of legitimacy, they are altogether illusory and void. The next in the lawful succession of the Royal Family of France are the descendants of Gaston of Orleans, son of Louis XIII. and brother of Louis XIV., and the headship of the House of Bourbon in France passes of right to the Comte de Paris, the eldest representative of the Orleans line. This fact was, we believe, fully acknowledged by the Duc de Bordeaux, who received the Comte de Paris as his heir; it has been confirmed by his recent touching interview with his cousins; and it would scarcely be worth while to advert to it, if doubts of a very ignorant character had not been loosely expressed in the journals of the day.

It is said by some who take a superficial view of human affairs, that the death and succession of the legitimate heir to the crown and the throne of France is a matter of entire indifference to France and to the world, since no such crown and no such throne are now in existence, and the French people are living under a republican form of government. But the traditions of a thousand years do not expire so easily. Even now it is surprising to note with what emotion the intelligence of the illness of the Duc de Bordeaux has been received throughout France, with what curiosity the bulletins from Frohsdorf have been read, what prayers have been offered up for his recovery, with what interest the future is discussed and the past recalled. It might be said that, so far from being a matter of indifference to the French nation, the Prince, who was the representative of the monarchy and the head of the

Royal house, was never brought nearer to the heart of a considerable portion of the people than at the moment of his illness. For by a curious revulsion the personage who had become impossible as a king, though he clung with tenacity to a crown he could not wear and to rights he could not exercise, has been, in this supreme hour of his existence, regarded and mourned as the impersonation of that hereditary and religious principle which has hitherto been in Europe the symbol of durable government and of the perpetuity of national life. Not indeed that these feelings are attributable to the sentimental loyalty which has been obliterated by a century of revolutions; but they infallibly mark a sense of insecurity in the present, and of anxiety for the future.

The life of Henri de Bordeaux has been a political blank. The murder of his father preceded his birth, which was accompanied by circumstances deemed in the fervent royalism of 1820 to be miraculous. But before he was ten years old he lost the crown by the obstinacy of his grandfather; and for half a century he has lingered in exile, not more estranged from his native country by absence than by his inflexible adherence to principles altogether alien to the French nation in the present age. He sacrificed the present and the future to a romantic belief in the past; and he maintained with unvarying dignity and honour the position to which he conceived himself to be born, although the majesty which surrounded him was but a dream and a delusion. We cannot withhold respect from a conscientious devotion to convictions, however erroneous and obsolete. The course of conduct which he conceived it to be his duty to follow was singularly unfavourable to the interests of the monarchy, and contributed rather to the revival of the Republic. The white flag to which he was indissolubly attached was the symbol of religious bigotry and royal autocracy in the eyes of the majority of the French nation. To restore the throne might at one moment, after the fall of the Second Empire, have been possible; but to restore the throne, in alliance with the priests, the nobles, and the traditions of the old monarchy, was beyond the power of man. That irrevocable past expires with its last representative: say rather it expired on the day when Louis XVI. laid his head upon the block; what has survived is but the shadow of its greatness.

The headship of the House of Bourbon passes, therefore, on the demise of the Comte de Chambord, to a prince educated in a different school. The Orleans family has shown, even in days of difficulty and danger, an unflinching attachment to the

destinies of France. Its members have, from the first, accepted and adopted the liberal principles of the Revolution. To take an illustration from our own history, the Duc de Bordeaux adhered, like the Stuarts and the Jacobites, to the theory of a monarchy founded on Divine right; the princes of the House of Orleans, like the English Whigs, acknowledge the principle of hereditary monarchy based on a constitutional compact with the estates of the realm and the representatives of the people. They have never quitted the soil of their native land, except when proscribed by the Convention or by the Napoleons. They have served in the ranks of the army; they have left no duty of French citizens unperformed. They are Frenchmen of the nineteenth century; and the cardinal principle of their policy and conduct has been and is to accept whatever form of government the will of the nation or the course of events may establish, looking solely to the welfare and the service of France. They have never sought to create or organise a political party in their own dynastic or personal interest. Faithful to their own belief in the principles of constitutional monarchy, as the system of government that combines the largest amount of freedom, toleration, and stability, and which was undoubtedly the goal and object of the wisest and noblest patriots at the outset of the Revolution, we believe it to be their fixed resolution never to attempt by violence or intrigue to subvert the existing institutions of the country, as long as they are adopted and sanctioned by the nation. Well were it for the Republic if it had no worse enemies than these princes of the House of Bourbon.

What may be the effect of this approaching change on the future course of events, we do not pretend or profess to surmise. In the present state of parties, of society, and of opinions in France, he must be a bold man who would hazard so much as a conjecture. We shall confine ourselves to the expression of a hope that the spirit of justice and moderation may not be wanting on any side, and that France will remember that she has no better or abler citizens than the representatives of her former sovereigns.

- - -
Errata.

- Page 3, line 10, for '1878' read '1876'
 " 5, " 15, for 'older' read 'younger'
 " 10, first line of the note, for 'Litha' read 'Latta'
 " 18, line 11, for 'Merela' read 'Murcia'

- - -
No. CCCXXIV. will be published in October.

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
OCTOBER, 1883.

No. CCCXXIV.

- ART. I.—1. *Nicolaus Copernicus*. Von LEOPOLD PROWE.
Erster Band: Das Leben. Berlin: 1883.
2. *Nicolai Copernici Torunensis De Revolutionibus Orbium
Caelestium Libri sex*. Warsaw: 1854.
3. *Nicolaus Copernicus aus Thorn über die Kreisbewegungen
der Welthörper*. Uebersetzt und mit Anmerkungen von
Dr. C. L. MENZZER. Thorn: 1879.

THE task which Dr. Prowe has successfully accomplished was one of no common difficulty. His undaunted industry and perseverance were heavily weighted by the lapse of time and the relentless progress of destruction. Since Nicholas Copernicus drew his last breath at Frauenburg, 340 years have gone by, not innocuously or in vain. Indeed, it seems as if an evil fate had from the first pursued the most authentic records of the life of that great man. The biographical narrative of his pupil Rheticus, written under his own eyes, and therefore absolutely trustworthy, perished, it might be said, at the birth; one man alone is known to have read it, and his high estimate of its value serves but to quicken our regret at its disappearance. The loss was, in truth, an altogether irreparable one. No subsequent efforts have availed to supply or even to mitigate it. Of all those who stood near to Copernicus in his declining years, or were in a position to gather up the yet living traditions of his youth, not one except the young stranger from Wittenberg (and he in but fugitive fashion) took heed of the responsibilities towards unnumbered generations to come, which those facilities laid upon them. Yet the silence which covered his grave was not the silence of ignorance or indifference. Far and near, on the banks of the Tiber no less than on the banks of the Vistula, the name of the Prussian ecclesiastie was known and revered as that of the

founder of a new and more sublime astronomy. In the interests of posterity, it would have been better had it been otherwise. The modern biographers of Copernicus would be well content if the memorials of their hero had been suffered to lie embalmed in the secure dust of forgetfulness. But, by a singular fatality, zeal conspired with neglect to intercept the sources of information. Some, who could have spoken much that we would now very gladly hear, kept silence; others, in their eagerness to promote an already wide-spread and ever-growing reputation, served as the unconscious agents of a devastation especially inalignant because deliberately selective.

The most prominent example of such unlucky though well-meant activity is afforded by Johannes Broscius, an astronomical professor of high reputation at the University of Cracow in the early part of the seventeenth century. In an evil hour he resolved to erect a literary monument to the memory of Copernicus, and undertook, in 1612, a journey to the scene of his life and labours in the Prussian province of Ermland for the purpose of collecting materials. The laudable end which he was known to have in view secured for him abundant opportunities, and he returned to Cracow laden with a rich booty of original documents, destined, as it was supposed, for immediate publication—destined rather, as it proved, to irretrievable destruction. Of the whole mass of invaluable papers which he had secured, two letters only saw the light; all the rest went the trackless ways of loss and ravage. Nor was this an isolated instance. Broscius and his fellows were succeeded by the armies of Gustavus Adolphus and the tenth and twelfth Charleses. But warlike pillage proved on the whole less deadly than learned curiosity. Many of the books and manuscripts carried off by the invaders are still safely preserved in Swedish libraries; others have been restored at the request of the Prussian Government; much, no doubt, has irrevocably disappeared.

It will thus be seen that the harvest which remained to be garnered by the labourers of recent times was a scanty and a scattered one. Indeed, it might be said that the sheaves of corn were long ago borne out of sight—in large measure, alas! to be trampled under foot or cast into the fire—while only the niggardly gleanings neglected amidst the profusion of early plunder were left to recompense the patient diligence of late comers. The most conspicuous amongst these is the author of the work now in part before us. Some idea of the enormous amount of labour embodied in it may be gathered from the fact that its publication has been delayed ten years, and is

still far from complete. Preparations were indeed being made for its production before the generation now in the prime of life had as yet assumed that 'muddy vesture' so unconsciously put on, so reluctantly put off. In 1852, Dr. Prowe made a journey to Sweden for the express purpose of searching out Copernican relics, and was rewarded with many valuable and interesting discoveries. We are not aware over what length of previous time his studies in the same direction had extended, but it may be presumed that no novice in Copernican literature could have been led to take such a step, or would have been capable of profiting by the opportunities which it offered when taken. The expedition, at any rate, formed the starting-point for a series of essays on separate points in the life of the great astronomer, which prepared, and have been absorbed into, the exhaustive biography published a few months back. This, however, constitutes only the first volume of the work, albeit a volume consisting of two 'parts,' each a goodly tome of some 500 pages; the second, if we apprehend the author's design rightly,* will comprise the few minor works and extant letters of Copernicus, together with a number of illustrative documents; the third will be devoted to commentary and explanation; the whole forming a worthy sequel to the centenary edition of the Copernican *opus magnum* issued at Thorn in 1873.

The biography, however, may be treated as a finished performance. Nothing has been excluded from it by which the personal history of its subject could be even remotely elucidated. Nor are we obliged to take a single statement on trust. A running commentary in the shape of foot-notes accompanies each page, setting forth the *ipsissima verba* of the authorities upon which the narrative is founded, together with an array of facts, arguments, and illustrative details of the highest value, but threatening at times to swamp and submerge the text in a flood of voluminous erudition. The book, indeed, is by no means one to tickle the palate of the epicure in reading, but requires for its enjoyment a good healthy appetite for knowledge, such as we fear is, at least in this country, under the influence of circulating libraries, a multifarious periodical literature, and what we may call *potted* learning in the form of popular abridgments, becoming daily rarer. Dr. Prowe's design was a widely different one from that of the meritorious writers who cater for the subscribers to Mudie's and the Grosvenor; but on the execution of that design he is well

* We have looked in vain for a statement of the plan of the work. The reader is compelled to gather it piecemeal from scattered notes.

entitled to congratulation. He has set before us a figure carved out of the granite of bare fact, neither polished up nor rounded off for the sake of pleasing effect, in the rough where details were wanting, set off by no showman's trickery, but impressive in the simplicity of unadorned truth.

The earliest biographer of Copernicus worthy the name was separated by an interval of above a hundred years in time, and of many hundred miles in space, from the life which he portrayed. Gassendi was, moreover, an astronomer writing of an astronomer, and it was inevitable that he should lean towards a scientific treatment of his subject. Indeed, the information at his disposal was of such a nature as to leave him no alternative. It referred almost exclusively to the contemplative function of the great man; it passed by with slight notice his personal relations and practical activities. From Gassendi's biography was formed the mental image of Copernicus which has, during the last two centuries, occupied a more or less prominent place in every cultured mind. We have all, in some dim fashion, pictured to ourselves a dark-browed ecclesiastic watching, amid the wintry mists of the Baltic, for glimpses of the wandering luminaries whose movements he had, in the course of long vigils, reduced to a marvellous and novel harmony; thinking thoughts that were not those of other men; heedless of, and unheeded by, the vulgar, the worldly, even, with few exceptions, the learned; but the various capacities of politician, scholar, economist, physician, administrator, which in the real man accompanied, and at times overshadowed, that of astronomer, were all but wholly ignored, and indeed have never until now been united into a complete, detailed, and authentic portrait.

This result has been achieved by the labours of many men extending over many decades. The field of enquiry was almost coextensive with Europe. The libraries and archives of Italy, Bohemia, Sweden, Prussia, and Poland, have all been examined, and have all yielded something to the search. Slowly and painfully, as the fruit of these toilsome enquiries, the true life of Copernicus has, at least partially, emerged from the shadow of four centuries. The simplicity of tradition is replaced by the complexity of actual existence. The four times nine years, during which the author held communion with his book, is perceived to have been not a span of unbroken leisure, but a period diversified by numerous avocations and distracted by urgent cares. Dr. Prowse's pages, in which the scattered items of information gleaned by his fellow-workers are collected and combined with data furnished by his

original researches, bring us well within sight, if they do not admit us to the intimacy, of the astronomer of Frauenburg. We stand, it is true, too far off to hear the tones of his voice or feel the pressure of his hand; but we can watch him as he passes to and fro along the various paths of his life, with the satisfactory conviction that the figure before us is no legendary creation, but a being of flesh and blood like ourselves.

A powerful tendency of our time impels us to demand this species of intercourse with the past. We can no longer accept ideal presentments of historical personages. We want to see them in the working clothes of everyday life, or, better still, in the dressing-gown and slippers of familiar privacy, rather than in the stately robes in which early biographers thought it only decent to array their heroes for introduction to a respected and respectful posterity. Moreover, as regards Copernicus, this critical and realistic 'movement' has been aided by another and an equally energetic sentiment.

The credit of having given birth to the modern Ptolemy was from the first claimed by both Germany and Poland. But it was not until 1807, when his bust by Schadow found a place in the Bavarian Wallhalla, that the dispute can properly be said to have begun to rage. The challenge conveyed in marble was met with a counter-challenge in bronze. Thorwaldsen received from the Polish authorities a commission to execute a national monument, which, emphasised by the defiant inscription, '*Nicolao Copernico grata patria,*' was solemnly unveiled at Warsaw, May 11, 1830. The dogs of war were now fairly let loose. Graven and moulded demonstrations were succeeded by the fiercer and sharper battle of pens. And the world of thought and letters has derived no small profit from the contest. Nothing quickens industry like a quarrel. No trouble, it is well known, can be too great if only an advantage can thereby be gained over an adversary. The ardour of enquiry was accordingly redoubled. Associations were set on foot, distant explorations were conducted, dusty archives ransacked, crabbed manuscripts deciphered, in part, no doubt, out of a natural and noble enthusiasm for a great name, but also in considerable measure for the sake of gratifying a childish national vanity. The purer zeal which tempered party spirit in some was, we readily admit, uncontaminated by it in others. But if its stimulus had been altogether wanting, the stream of Copernican research would assuredly have flowed in a more sluggish current. The admixture of vulgar motive may thus be freely pardoned for the sake of the gain secured through it.

The question as to whether Copernicus was a German or a Pole is still far from being decided; it may be doubted whether it is capable of decision. The truth is, that argument on the subject is idle, because turning on the meaning of a word incapable of exact definition. In the eyes of the law, a man's nationality depends, at least *primâ facie*, on the place of his birth; but in common parlance the idea signified by that much-abused term is a highly complex one, into which birth, parentage, and education enter in proportions varying with varying circumstances. It may indeed be stated without fear of contradiction that the earliest of modern astronomers was a Prussian; but that statement is only the beginning of perplexities. For the term 'Prussia' bore a widely different signification, both geographical and political, four centuries ago, from that which it conveys to our minds.

Then, as now, on the great Sarmatian plain stretching down to the Baltic, a Slav and a German power stood confronting each other. The kingdom of Poland and the Teutonic Order were, it is true, but puny representatives of the two great Northern empires of modern times; but Europe still bears profound traces of their compacts and conflicts, their short friendship and long enmity, of the jostlings and swayings of the rival populations subject to them. Into this seething cauldron of incipient nationalities the lot of Copernicus was cast. Let us try to realise its conditions a little more distinctly.

The 'Teutonic Knights of St. Mary of Jerusalem' made their first appearance on the banks of the Vistula in the year 1228. They had a great work before them, and they prospered in doing it. Hermann of Salza, their fourth Grand Master, had once declared that he would give an eye to be able to lead ten knights into the field. He lived to see two thousand ready to spring into the saddle at his word. It took them, however, rather more than half a century fully to subdue the heathen Prussian tribes who had long harried the Masovian fields with impunity, and to compact their land of moor and fen and forest into an independent state, subject to the exclusive sovereignty of the Order. The province of 'Prussia' thus energetically won for the Gospel was not less energetically secured for civilisation. German immigrants thronged in, towns and villages were founded, and German burgher-life took root in the soil. Nobles who had come to aid in a sacred warfare remained to build castles and cultivate estates. Agriculture was promoted with a persistent zeal which still excites astonishment and admiration. A judicious system of drainage turned unprofitable marshes into waving meadows

and smiling cornfields. Forests were eradicated; low-lying lands protected against inundation; sandy hillocks were planted with the vine,* and the exiled fruit of the South was persuaded to swell and sweeten under the reluctant rays of a northern sun; bees were taught to labour disinterestedly; even the sea yielded its precious tribute of amber, and its scarcely less precious tribute of herrings and sturgeon. The prosperity of the Order culminated about the close of the fourteenth century. Its territory then extended from the mouth of the Oder to the Gulf of Finland; its net revenue amounted to 800,000 Rhenish florins; 55 towns, 48 fortified castles, and numerous villages had sprung up on Prussian soil.

But its fall was already at hand. The spirit of its original foundation waned with the waxing of its fortunes. The straw pallet and bread and water of the first knights were replaced by luxurious living, and all the splendours that pride could devise or power compass. The white mantle and black cross gradually came to be associated no longer with heroic abnegation, but with insolent self-indulgence, not untainted with debauchery. The Galahads and Godfreys of the Order, in short, became few and fewer; the Bois-Guilberts and De Bracys crept into the ascendant.

To internal degeneracy was added external disaster. The bloody defeat of Tanneuberg in 1410 brought in its train all the circumstances which accompany and precipitate the fall of a State--financial collapse, disaffection of mercenaries, infatuated counsels, rejection of timely reform. Rebellion ensued, and was successful. The Prussian 'Bund,' in which cities and nobles for once sank their differences under the influence of a common detestation, invoked the aid of Poland in 1453. The resulting war lasted thirteen years, and cost the lives, it is said, of 350,000 men. It issued in a treaty signed at Thorn, October 19, 1466, according to the provisions of which the tract watered by the Vistula and its tributaries, thenceforward known as 'Royal' or 'West Prussia,' became incorporated with the Polish kingdom, though retaining local independence; while for the eastward-lying remnant of its ancient possessions the Order was compelled to do homage to the triumphant Slav power.

In one of the earlier years of this long struggle, a merchant

* Prowe, 'Westpreussen in seiner geschichtlichen Stellung zu Deutschland und zu Polen,' p. 9. Dr. Hirsch tells us ('Danzigs Handelsgeschichte,' p. 262) that all the Prussian vines perished in the cold winter of 1436-7, and were replanted only at Thorn.

named Niklas Koppernigk* removed the seat of his business from Cracow to Thorn. His patronymic was of the local character ordinarily found in Poland. It indicated a migration of his ancestors from the village of Kopirnik near Frankenstein in Silesia, and possibly also commemorated their early relations with certain then existent copper-mines, from the neighbourhood of which the village in question had derived its title. Nicholas was a well-to-do-man. He carried on mercantile transactions on a considerable scale in Dantzic and Breslau, as well as in Cracow and Thorn; in 1458 he was admitted to the citizenship of his adopted town, and exercised judicial or assessorial functions there during nineteen years.† Although well advanced towards middle life when he left Cracow, he was still unmarried; but repaired the omission, some time *previous* to 1464, by taking to wife Barbara Watzelrode, a member of a distinguished family in which the highest civic dignities of Thorn had been hereditary for close upon a century. The youngest of four children—two sons and two daughters—born of this union, came into the world in an old house, of which the walls are still standing, at the corner of St. Anne's Street and the Street of Bakers, on February 19, 1473, and was baptised by his father's name.

Thorn was at that time a thriving town of about 20,000 inhabitants. In aspect it appears to have remained substantially unchanged. It is even now enclosed by the ancient walls, and access is had to its quaint streets by the ancient gates; only the busy suburbs have disappeared which, in the fifteenth century, formed the scene of its most active trades. Nevertheless, its prosperity was then already on the decline.

Founded in 1231‡ by the Teutonic Knights, the com-

* The Latinised form of the name belongs exclusively to the astronomer, having been constructed by himself for literary purposes. Up to his sixtieth year he spelt it *Coppernicus*; and the 'Copernicus-Verein' of Thorn has formally decreed the adoption of the double *p*. But, in our opinion, the prescription of three and a half centuries, combined with the example of the bearer of the appellation during the last ten years of his life, and the authority of the title-page of his immortal work, fully justify the rejection of the proposed innovation.

† The merit of clearing up the manifold obscurities which surrounded the father of Copernicus belongs to Dr. Prowe.

‡ There seems little doubt that an earlier town of 'Thorun' had existed on the same site. See R * * *, 'Beiträge zur Beantwortung 'der Frage nach der Nationalität des N. Copernicus,' p. 201.

mercial capital of the new State quickly rose to importance. The hands of its merchants held for above one hundred years the threads of communication between central and western Europe. Its ships bore the produce of the Hungarian mines and the Sarmatian plains to the mouth of the Scheldt, and brought back Flemish cloths and Lisbon salt, wine and oil and fruits from the South, spices and silks from the East. Contingents from Thorn joined the warlike expeditions of the Hanseatic League, and deputies from Thorn attended its councils; it was not, in fact, until Dantzic, towards the close of the fourteenth century, began to assert the superiority of its maritime situation, that the 'Queen of the Vistula' ceased to be regarded as the chief representative of Prussian civic existence.

Now Prussian civic existence bore, from the first, a purely German stamp. Although one half of the inhabitants of Thorn are said to have been of Slav origin,* they were mainly of the poorer sort, and were held in little account. The merchant-aristocracy of the town was Teutonic in speech and blood; the municipal laws were framed on German models; German (or Latin) was the language of courts, of councils, and of guilds. This Teutonic character was jealously maintained during three centuries and upwards of Polish sovereignty. From the epoch of its foundation within five miles of the Polish frontier until now, Thorn has in fact been as an outpost of the Fatherland in a strange country.

Our readers will by this time have perceived that the conflicting national pretensions to ownership in the reformer of astronomy afford a subject of debate as little likely to be speedily exhausted as the succession of the Khalifs or the purpose of the Great Pyramid. His father was a Pole, his mother a German. He was born in a town owing allegiance to the Polish crown, but clinging closely to its German privileges. He was, in a word, a German citizen, but a Polish subject. We shall see that a cosmopolitan education completed the mixed associations of his life.

His father died when he was ten years old, leaving him, with his elder brother Andrew, to the guardianship of his maternal uncle. The charge could not have been placed in more competent hands. Lucas Watzelrode was a man deeply imbued with the culture of his time. Before he was twenty-two he had studied at three universities, and at one of them

* R * * *, 'Beiträge,' p. 73. The father of Copernicus may be regarded as a Slav germanised by his connexions and associations.

had taken a doctor's degree. Nevertheless, unsatisfied with all that Cracow, Leipzig, and Prague could teach him, he sold a portion of his patrimony, and equipped himself with the proceeds for a journey across the Alps. He returned, after four years of study at Bologna, bringing with him the diploma of a doctor of canon law. The brilliant prospects which his acquirements, his family connexions, and his known abilities held out before him, were abundantly, and with little delay, realised. As Bishop of Ermland, he attained, February 19, 1489, to the highest temporal as well as spiritual dignity of his native land. His care for his orphaned nephews was active, untiring, and judicious. That they should be provided for in the Church was a matter of course. The utmost required by the public conscience of the time was that they should be suitably prepared to occupy positions of which the privileges were kept more fully in sight than the responsibilities. This duty Bishop Lucas discharged with truly paternal zeal.

Nicholas Copernicus matriculated at Cracow towards the close of the year 1491. The reputation of the 'Jagellonian University' stood then at its highest. Students flocked to it from all parts of Germany as well as from Hungary and Sweden; a thousand auditors daily thronged the lecture-halls in St. Anne's Street, where the 'Æneid,' the 'Georgics,' and the 'Metamorphoses' already competed for favour with the more austere attractions of Boethius 'De Consolatione,' Aristotle 'De Animâ,' Donatus, Priscian, and Francisus Niger. Nor did they compete with the arms of rhetoric and the charms of style alone. Swords were sharpened, and bludgeons weighted, for the attack and defence of the new learning lately imported from Italy by the vagrant humanists, Filippo Buonaccorsi (Callimachus) and Conrad Celtes; national animosities added virulence to scholastic debates; and the ill-named Alley of Brothers was the frequent scene of bloody frays between the Hungarian students of 'De Ente et Essentiâ,' and the German admirers of the 'De Officiis' and the 'De Amicitia.' In such excesses we may be sure that Copernicus was no participator. His serious and profound intelligence was incapable of admitting, scarcely even of comprehending, the extravagances of folly and of faction. He imbibed, it is true, a considerable share of that enthusiasm for classical antiquity which an ardent band of neo-pagan renovators had almost raised to the dignity of a new worship; but it was a regulated enthusiasm, such as animates, without enslaving, thought.

Of far greater importance, however, for the future work of

Copernicus than humanistic fervours or grammatical subtleties, were the scientific teachings of Albert Brudzewski. These, in the dearth of efficient mathematical training north of the Alps, formed at that period the chief glory and the most potent attraction of the Polish University. But the sole title to honour with posterity of the once famous professor is that the charm and distinctness of his method of imparting knowledge originated or confirmed the astronomical vocation of one illustrious pupil.

We learn with interest that Copernicus attained at this time some proficiency in the use of the pencil, as well as of the astrolabe and quadrant. Gassendi tells us* that he studied optics and 'perspective,' or drawing, and succeeded, with the help of a mirror, in making an excellent portrait of himself. This afterwards came into the possession of Tycho Brahe, and unluckily perished by fire at Uranienburg in 1597.

No degree was taken by him at Cracow. Dr. Prowe makes it appear highly probable that he quitted the university at the end of three years, whereas a residence of four was a *sine quâ non* for obtaining the baccalaureate. But those three years were not the least momentous, as they were perhaps amongst the most brilliant and hopeful, of his life. He made many friends; his connexions were numerous and influential. Social pleasures and distinctions must have been abundantly at his command had he chosen to avail himself of them. Moreover, at Cracow (so far as the available information enables us to judge), his intellectual life first took shape and strength. Regiomontanus† was then the idol of the Northern schools of astronomy. His authority was held supreme. He had brought the science as near to perfection as the shortness of his dazzling career rendered possible. His name was held in honour second only to that which encompassed the unapproachable reputation of Ptolemy. Yet Regiomontanus did not seem to Copernicus to have spoken the last word concerning the science of the skies. Or, if he had, nature expressed herself in different language. The great question arose, was that language intelligible to the human mind, or must facts and their interpretations remain for ever fundamentally incongruous, held together in a strained and unnatural union? Copernicus believed that there was a truth of things as well as of words; that not delusively, or in vain, had the world

* *Vita Copernici*, p. 5.

† Johannes Müller, called 'Regiomontanus' from his birthplace, Königsberg in Franconia. He died at Rome, aged 40, July 6, 1476.

been delivered over to the contemplation of man; and that the perplexing appearances presented by the heavenly bodies were no will-o'-the-wisp deceptions, but faithful indications of real facts, needing only to be sincerely expounded by simple, straightforward reasoning, apart from the crooked ways of prejudice.

With the germs at least of these thoughts in his mind, he left Craeow, as it would seem, in the autumn of the year 1494. He found his native town in a ferment of political excitement. The arrival of John Albert, the new Polish king, to receive the homage of his Prussian subjects, gave occasion to agitated debates and anxious negotiations, in which the nearest relatives of Copernicus were deeply engaged. Privileges had to be secured, jealousies appeased, the accumulated mutual distrust of years obliterated. That is to say, all this was desired, something of it was attempted, a very little accomplished. A *modus vivendi* was, however, arranged. The oath was taken, the king departed, and Thorn had leisure to reflect on another event highly disturbing to the equanimity of a mercantile community. Strange news had recently penetrated to the Baltic. It was said that a bold Genoese navigator had reached the Indies sailing west, and an uneasy apprehension as to the consequences began to gain ground among the thriving members of the Hansa. What if the ancient trade-routes came ere long to be deserted for the broad ocean-track leading to a new world? Could it reasonably be expected that the demand for dried fish and timber, for tar, ashes, and hemp from Northern seas and shores, would retain its briskness in Iberian markets flooded with the produce of an Eldorado, a land of Ophir, and an Araby the Blest in one? Many an earnest discussion on these and similar topics doubtless met the ears of Copernicus; but very different must have been the meditations inspired to him by the intelligence of the marvellous voyage. The world was widened—to the imagination—indefinitely; possibilities became more immediate, enterprise more hopeful. In the heavens, as well as on the earth, adventure might be attempted. The vast regions of space, navigated only by the shining craft of the skies, might prove not inaccessible to arduous thoughts, and the system of the sun and planets might, in its turn, find a Columbus.

An interval of two years broke the sequence of the young astronomer's academical studies. There is some reason to believe that he was waiting for an appointment secured somewhat more tardily than had been hopefully expected. In September, 1495, a vacancy occurred in the chapter of the diocese

of Ermland. But it fell in a 'papal' month,* and Bishop Watzelrode's influence at Rome was insufficient to obtain the nomination for his nephew. Two years later, however, the incumbent was obliging enough to die in August, whereupon Nicholas Copernicus, at the age of twenty-four, attained the dignity, and was ensured the emoluments of Canon of Frauenburg.

He was by that time already in Italy. Of the influences which he there encountered we have spoken in an article designed to indicate the origin and trace the development of his cosmical ideas.† It suffices here to state the chief results of recent enquiries into his personal history and circumstances.

Copernicus entered the University of Bologna, as a student of canon law, at the opening of the winter term of 1496-7. The occurrence of his name in the annals of the 'Natio Germanorum' ‡ must be regarded as a strong point in favour of the upholders of his Teutonic origin. Indeed, taken in connexion with his unquestioned use of German as his mother-tongue, it might—at least by impartial outsiders possessing intelligence of the ordinary blunt, though serviceable type—be fairly held to terminate the controversy. This, however, seems beyond hope. Controversies rarely die save of inanition. For adverse facts they not unfrequently prove to have the digestion of ostriches. And in the present instance, where common sense and technical argument might be said to be arrayed one against the other, it is plain that the view taken depends, in great measure, upon the natural bias of the mind.

The next that we hear of the brothers Copernicus (for Andrew followed, after the lapse of two years, in the steps of Nicholas) relates to their pecuniary difficulties. The expenses of even the most frugal life in Bologna were, according to the standard of that time, extremely high. And frugality was by no means the rule amongst the medley of tribes frequenting the professorial haunts in the Via San Mamolo. How far the two Prussian youths allowed themselves to be carried by the whirl of undisciplined existence around them

* In the *odd* months of the year, according to the stipulations of the German Concordats, nominations to vacant canonries were reserved to the Roman Curia; in the *even* months they belonged to the bishop of the diocese. (Prowse, *Th. i.* p. 172, *note.*)

† *Edinburgh Review*, vol. cxlvi. pp. 102-114.

‡ Malagola, '*Della Vita di Antonio Urceo*,' Bologna, 1878, pp. 313, 561.

we have no means of knowing, but it is certain that in the autumn of 1499 they were completely at the end of their resources,* and that their necessities were relieved by a loan of a hundred ducats, raised in Rome, at beggaring interest, on the security of their uncle's name. The transaction, however, was a strictly honourable one, and the money borrowed appears to have been promptly repaid. Holy Week of the Jubilee year found them both in Rome, and they were, no doubt, amongst the two hundred thousand who knelt in the piazza of St. Peter's to receive the Easter blessing of Alexander VI. Their stay lasted a full year. Nicholas himself informs us that he there, on November 6, 1500, observed an eclipse of the moon; † and we learn from Rheticus that he lectured during the ensuing winter on mathematical (or astronomical) subjects before brilliant and crowded audiences.‡ The summer was consumed in a journey to Frauenburg for the purpose of obtaining from the Chapter (of which the elder brother became a member in 1499) leave to prolong their absence; and on their return to Italy, Andrew proceeded once more to Rome, while Nicholas halted at Padua.

The 'University of the Ox' § was the classic school of medicine, and to medicine Copernicus had pledged himself to devote the years of study yet before him. The earlier canons against the practice of the healing art by ecclesiastics had, before then, fallen obsolete, or rather they had gradually become restricted to the surgical branch of the profession. The service of the altar, even the dignity of the episcopate, was no longer held incompatible with the skilled treatment of disease; but no sacred office was permitted to be exercised by those whose hearts (it was supposed) were hardened by the familiar use of the knife and the cautery. Copernicus, however, although the holder of two benefices, || never became a

* Dr. Hipler points out ('Kopernikus und Luther,' p. 24) that the regular allowance made to them by the Chapter—forty-five marks a year each—was entirely inadequate to meet their inevitable expenditure, unless supplemented by private means or an allowance from their uncle.

† *De Revolutionibus Orbium Cœlestium*, lib. iv. cap. 14.

‡ 'Narratio Prima,' p. 490 of Baranowski's edition of the works of Copernicus cited at the head of this article.

§ So called from the gilt figure adorning the building in which the lectures were delivered.

|| He was 'Scholasticus' in Breslau as well as Canon of Frauenburg. The first office appears to have been a pure sinecure. He was in possession of it certainly in 1503, probably earlier, and held it until 1538.

priest; and the remedies with which he was conversant were of the milder kind provided in the pharmacopœia. Moreover, his application to astronomy peculiarly fitted him, according to the ideas prevalent in those days, for application to medicine. Planetary conjunctions, it was firmly believed, powerfully affected the action of drugs; the occurrence and course of diseases were included in the horoscope of the patient; each part of the body had its appropriate constellation; the choice between potions, pills, and electuaries depended on the situation of the moon in the zodiac. Medical students were accordingly compelled to acquaint themselves with the science of the celestial revolutions; and the physician might be regarded in Copernicus as the natural development of the astronomer.

His residence at Padua lay, until quite recently, under a cloud of uncertainty. The fact was asserted by Papadopoli* in 1726, and found a place in all subsequent biographies of Copernicus; but the decorative particulars added by the historian of the Patavian university having been shown to be wholly incorrect, it seemed unreasonable to rely on his discredited authority for the fundamental circumstance. Fortunately, however, in this instance destructive criticism was corrected by further research. The discovery by Signor Cittadella, of Ferrara, in 1876, of the doctoral diploma of the illustrious foreigner, proves that the older statements corresponded with, though they somewhat distorted, the real state of the case. This document† lets us know that Nicholas Copernicus 'of Prussia,' having studied at Bologna *and at Padua*, was decorated with the ring and berretta of a doctor in canon law, on the last day of May, 1503, in the episcopal palace at Ferrara. That a student of three universities should have gone for his degree to a fourth, where he did not attend a single lecture, or enrol himself as the pupil of a single professor, appears sufficiently strange. It was, however, at that period by no means an unusual proceeding. The expenses of graduation, both at Bologna and Padua, were large, and its conditions arduous. Ferrara offered facilities in both respects, of which Copernicus did not disdain to avail himself. With the completion of his medical studies at Padua, his prolonged academical career was finally brought to a close. He recrossed the Alps, and left Italy, to visit it no more, in the summer of 1505.

A new and totally untried life now opened before Copernicus.

He was thirty-two years of age, but his pursuits had hitherto been exclusively those of a student. The time had at length come for using the materials so carefully and copiously accumulated. His work in the world was about to begin.

He seems to have plunged straightway into the agitated politics of his native land. Long-forgotten records of the proceedings of certain local assemblages in the autumn months of 1505 and 1506 have given up his name as that of one sharing in their deliberations. But physicians were scarcer than politicians in those remote regions, and his uncle claimed both his services and his society. By a resolution of the Chapter, dated January 7, 1507, he was appointed permanent medical attendant on the bishop, and had already, it is tolerably certain, taken up his quarters at the episcopal residence.

The Castle of Heilsberg, still one of the most imposing relics of feudal times, was situated about forty-six miles from the cathedral-town of Frauenburg, in the heart of the diocese of Ermland. The undulating country by which it was surrounded was then richly wooded with oak and beech; from the battlements the eye commanded a view of extensive forests varied by frequent sheets of standing water; while the rivers Alle and Sinser, which united to encompass the building with a kind of natural moat, cut their way between pleasant pastures, blue-green patches of flax, and fields waving with barley, rye, and oats. The lowering front of the walls, however, somewhat belied the peaceful aspect of their environment. And in truth the normal condition of the country was one of peril and disturbance.

The gloomy suggestions of the exterior were, however, replaced within by impressions of a totally different character. The fortress was transformed, as the grand entrance was left behind, into the palace of a mediæval prince. The open square, round which the edifice was built, was continually thronged with a motley crowd of ecclesiastics, pages, serving-men, jugglers, rope-dancers, bear-leaders; its graceful Gothic arcades echoed the songs of wandering minstrels, the shrill jest of the court-fool, the stern command of the majordomo; envoys hurried through it, big with important missions from the Court of Cracow, or the Chapter-house of Königsberg; vaivodes, castellans, burgomasters, deputies from the Prussian States, grave prebendaries dismounting from their palfreys, messengers spurring from the scene of the latest frontier-outrage, jostled with young noblemen in waiting, the lounging favourites of society, and with mendicants expecting their dole, its shrinking outcasts.

Precisely at noon each day, the tolling of the great bell gave the signal to all the inmates of the castle to assemble for the midday meal under the groined and granite-pillared porticoes of the arcade. Then the doors of the episcopal apartments were flung open; the castle mastiffs, just unloosed, rushed out, loudly baying their exultation in liberty and expectancy of food; and the bishop, clad in full choir-costume, attended by vicar, chief justice, chaplain, marshal, and chamberlain, and followed by his guests and retainers in orderly procession, led the way across the courtyard to the grand banqueting-hall. There eight separate tables were spread, corresponding to eight different degrees of dignity;* for, from the mitred ruler himself to the lowest scullion in his kitchen, each had his ascertained place, fixed by ordinance and assigned by authority. It is curious to read that one of these eight tables was set apart for jugglers and buffoons, and was placed in a conspicuous position—in *medio cœnaculi*—so that the whole company might freely and equally enjoy the quaint antics, fantastic gestures, quips and sallies, with which these Prussian Touchstones and Wambas repaid the episcopal hospitality. A table was also provided for certain poor persons chosen daily by the bishop, and these were served at the same time with the highest dignitaries, while the attendants, in two relays, took their food later, the inferior menials waiting upon the superior, and being at last regaled with the ragged remnants of the feast.

Day after day, for six years, Copernicus formed part of the stately procession to the banqueting-hall of the Castle of Heilsberg. Day after day, too, he must have shared the anxieties which weighed heavily on its chief inmate. The position of the Bishop of Ermland was, at that juncture, a singularly anomalous and a singularly onerous one. Contradictory obligations were forced upon him, irreconcilable privileges conferred upon him. He was at once a Prince of the Empire and a vassal of Poland; he was *ex officio* a member of the Polish Senate and virtual viceroy of the Polish king in West Prussia; yet he was expected, as president of the assemblies of his native country, to give a voice to the sullen murmurs of Prussian discontent with the Polish Government, and to represent and organise the stirrings of Prussian resistance to Polish encroachments.

By an arrangement conferring on them in perpetual possession one full third of the territory conquered by the Teutonic

* See the 'Ordinancia castri Heilsbergk' quoted by Prowe, Th. i. pp. 359-62, *note*.

Knights, the Prussian bishops were, from the first, placed on the footing of temporal princes. Ermland was the largest of four Prussian dioceses erected on these terms in 1243, and the only one which succeeded in preserving its independence. The Bishops of Ermland thus continued to rule a little State about the size of Lancashire as sovereign princes, though with a sovereignty limited in practice by the near neighbourhood and admitted suzerainty of the Order. Its mode of government remained unaffected by the Treaty of Thorn, save only that the paramount rights previously vested in the Grand Masters were transferred to the kings of Poland.

The political problem which presented itself for solution to Lucas Watzelrode was one which might have tasked the astuteness of a Mazarin or a Philip II. It was required of him to conciliate and hold in check three near neighbours, all mutually hostile, two of them powerful and ambitious, and the third restless and discontented. Of these the most imminently menacing was the Teutonic Order. From that once splendid and energetic body the old spirit had long ago departed. Its very existence was a standing sacrilege. Immorality and irreligion had deeply tainted the life-blood which once flowed bright with the vital spirit of ardent, austere, and chivalric devotion. Its removal or reform had become an urgent necessity; but to speech neither of removal nor of reform would the Order itself listen. Its designs were of a widely different kind, and it seemed as if power would not be wanting for their execution. The interests and the honour of Germany were deeply involved in the maintenance of an institution which, even in its decay, was still an outwork of the German Empire, and offered a dignified provision to the lack-land scions of noble German houses. In reliance, accordingly, upon German promises of support, successive Grand Masters persistently refused the stipulated oath of fealty to Poland, and nothing less was dreamed of than the recovery of the province alienated by the disastrous Treaty of Thorn. A sullen and lowering peace was meantime a visible prelude to war, of which the first and surest victim must be the defenceless territory of Ermland.

Under these circumstances the bishop leaned upon Poland for protection against the still formidable power on the east. But by so doing he bitterly offended his neighbours on the west. Hatred of the Teutonic Order was, in all the three estates of West Prussia, being rapidly superseded by hatred of Poland. It was not that they detested their former masters less, but that they detested their new rulers more. They did

not repent having shaken off one yoke, but they had not bargained for finding it replaced by another. They began to discover that they had acted not unlike the horse in *Æsop's* fable, who consented to be bitted and mounted in order to secure the alliance of the man against his enemy the stag. The truth was that they had flattered themselves with the hope of receiving all and giving nothing in exchange. They had expected to reap all the advantages of union, while bearing none of its burdens. They had invoked the aid of a strong power; they refused to pay the price which that power was certain, sooner or later, to exact. The articles of incorporation had been loosely drawn; they were naturally interpreted in widely different senses by the two contracting parties. The Prussians clung passionately to the separate privileges secured by them; the Poles insisted on the reality of the covenanted union. And on their side were time, force, and the natural assimilative power of a victorious nationality.

It is thus easily seen that Lucas Waizelrode's position was a delicate one. Nor were his qualities of the kind to enable him to steer his way prosperously in such dangerous waters. He was a strenuous rather than a successful politician. He had abundance of energy, but was deficient in suppleness and resource. The numerous and admirable designs, upon the formation of which he expended abilities of no common order, uniformly failed. And the uprightness of his intentions availed little to appease the wrath excited by his unacceptable proposals of reform.

Of the last disquieted years of his uncle's life, Copernicus was the almost inseparable companion. A contemporary poet, not unwilling to air a Virgilian allusion, compared their relations to those of *Æneas* and *Achates*; and a prevalent impression of intimacy and fidelity may very possibly be recorded by the trite illustration. They were, at any rate, seldom apart; not only dwelling together at Heilsberg, but travelling together to Elbing and Marienburg for meetings of the Prussian deputies, to Petrikan, Thorn, and Cracow on the occasions of Polish Diets, conferences, and royal solemnities. The prolongation of one of these numerous absences from February 22 to May 4, 1509, gave Copernicus the opportunity of sending to the recently founded press of Cracow a little work interesting chiefly from the circumstances of its appearance. It was the first translation from the Greek published in Sarmatian regions, and it was the only work of any kind which Copernicus voluntarily chose to publish. The *Epistles of Theophylactus Simocatta*, a late Byzantine writer, were

used as a text-book in Italy from 1499, the year of their publication by Aldus. Copernicus seems to have read them with Codrus Urceus before leaving Bologna, and thought them worthy of being introduced to his countrymen in a Latin translation. Dr. Prowe gives us to understand that the Copernican version betrays more enthusiasm for Greek culture than proficiency in Greek scholarship; but it must be remembered (as our author hastens to point out) that the study was then in its infaney, and that the absence of modern facilities rendered shortcomings inevitable, even in men of high acquirements, which would not now be tolerated in the fifth form at Eton.

Three years later, King Sigismund of Poland celebrated his wedding-feast at Cracow, and the Bishop of Ermland was bidden to attend. His nephew was, as usual, in his train, but, for some unexplained reason, failed to accompany him on his return---a circumstance which he had reason to regret. For, soon after leaving Cracow, the bishop showed symptoms of illness, and, refusing to allow his journey to be interrupted, reached Thorn in aspect more like a corpse than a living man. The municipal physician was out of the way, no other medical aid was at hand, nor would it, we may be assured, have been of any avail, for the sickness was visibly unto death. Yet it must have been a bitter reflection to Copernicus that his post was found vacant just at the moment of the fatal surprise.

Lucas Watzelrode died three days after reaching his native town, March 29, 1512, at the age of sixty-four. He was a man to whom life presented itself in no festal guise. Seldom seen to smile, he lacked the arts whether to conciliate goodwill, or to appease malice; yet both were sorely needed under the arduous circumstances amidst which his lot was cast. The force of his mind, his clear discernment, unbending will, and indefatigable energy rendered him a formidable opponent; and he had no faculty of social endearment by which to soften the austere impressions of his uncompromising vigour and unhesitating love of justice. His life was accordingly pursued by malignant hatred, and softened by few affections. As an ecclesiastical ruler, he merits high praise for his earnestness in the reform of abuses,* and intrepidity in defence of the menaced liberties of his Church; and as a man of letters he was not

* He issued, for instance, Sept. 1, 1489, a strict edict against hawkers of indulgences, and proceeded rigorously against bad priests. See A. Thiel in '*Zeitschrift für die Geschichte und Alterthumskunde Ermlands*,' Band i. p. 245.

unworthy to fill the see once occupied by Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini.

Shortly after the death of his uncle, Copernicus resumed his place in the Chapter of Frauenburg. But here a fresh sorrow awaited him. His brother Andrew's early career had, as we have already in part seen, run strictly parallel with his own. They had been together at Cracow, at Bologna, at Rome; they had obtained admittance to the same religious corporation, and together closed their years of study and travel. But, not long after their return from Italy, Andrew showed the first symptoms of a disease terribly familiar in mediæval times, though in our part of the world now happily unknown. The number of leper hospitals in Europe in the thirteenth century was estimated by Matthew Paris at 19,000; religious orders were founded for the care of those afflicted with the loathsome malady, and their treatment was a prominent object of medical study. The disease had, however, before the close of the fifteenth century, ceased to be epidemic, and only kept alive the memory of its horrors by seizing upon an occasional victim. One of these was Andrew Copernicus. Few and dismal are the particulars known relative to the calamity by which he was overwhelmed. In 1508 he left Frauenburg to try the effect of southern air and southern skill. He returned only to encounter aggravated sufferings. In 1512 his infectious presence was dispensed with at the sittings of the Chapter. Whither he now carried his burden of misery is doubtful—probably once more to Italy—but it is certain that he finally laid it down some time between the years 1516 and 1519.

The life which Copernicus was henceforth to share with a score of other prebendaries at Frauenburg resembled a collegiate rather than an ecclesiastical one. It was learned, it was decorous, it was profitably occupied, but it was in little more than in name devoted to the service of religion. Here, as elsewhere, much of the laxity had crept in, which the stringent regulations of the Council of Trent were later directed to counteract. Very few of the canons were in priest's or even in deacon's orders; most of them (Copernicus, there is every reason to believe, amongst the number) had not passed beyond the preparatory stage of an acolyte. It can only occasion surprise to find so many admirable bishops—some of them still held in venerated memory—issuing from a body of men who were willing to take the wages, while reluctant to perform the work, of the Church.

The functions of the Chapter were largely administrative.

Their domains constituted an *imperium in imperio* within the diocese. Indeed, the organisation of Ermland reminds us of nothing so much as of certain Chinese toys, which exhibit a seemingly endless succession of delicately wrought spheres, each contained within the other, and each perfect in itself. Out of the original territory of the Order a third had been carved to form the endowment of the bishop; out of the territory of the bishop a third was again carved to form the endowment of the Chapter. Moreover, to each canon was assigned an *allodium*, or manor, within the bounds of which, as well as in his household, he exercised jurisdiction, both criminal and civil; and like powers were freely delegated to feudal tenants. This complicated system—in which, however, some degree of unity was maintained by the reservation to the Chapter of the right of appeal—would seem, in defiance of theoretical objections, to have worked well. No complaints of misgovernment, at least, have become audible even to the attentive ears of modern enquirers.

An existence of no small dignity, some usefulness, and little trouble, was that led by a canon of Frauenburg in those days. His income was equivalent to about 450*l.* a year of our money. He had a convenient dwelling-place (*curia*) within the precincts of the cathedral, as well as a demesne in the country adjacent to it. His establishment consisted of *at least* two serving-men and three horses. His colleagues were men of good birth, superior education, and cultivated tastes, united not only by the pressure of corporate interests, but by the closer ties of kindred and fellow-citizenship. The Chapter, indeed, was so extensively recruited from mutually related families belonging to the mercantile aristocracies of Thorn and Dantzic, that it might almost be called a family coterie. Learning was held there in especial honour. Academical studies were not only encouraged, but required. A large proportion of the canons had taken degrees in Italy, and a minimum residence of three years at some university was obligatory upon all.

It was thus in no uncongenial atmosphere that Copernicus spent the last thirty years of his life. His amiable and earnest character won for him affection; his scientific attainments commanded admiration. He could, it is true, in his efforts towards the reform of astronomy, expect no competent assistance, and little technical understanding; but he was sure of intelligent sympathy. His labours must be solitary, but they would at least be respected.

As regards the progress of his thoughts on cosmical subjects, we can gather from his noble epistle to Pope Paul III.,

combined with a single remark of Rheticus, that he had no sooner begun to examine the contradictory teachings of the schools, and to compare them with what was visible in the skies, than he conceived a profound distrust of the prevalent systems. With ideas thus loosened from their foundations—*animo liber*, as Kepler said of him—he went to Italy, and there heard much of the so-called Pythagorean tenets as to the celestial revolutions. He resolved to examine for himself, unsealed the fount of rejuvenescent knowledge with the help of Codrus Urceus and the scanty Greek vocabulary of the monk Chrestonius, read eagerly, thought deeply, and at last, invoking antiquity against antiquity, Samos and Sicily against Alexandria, threw off the yoke which Ptolemy had imposed upon forty generations. The main lines of his immortal work were laid down at Heilsberg during the years 1506–12. The still more laborious task remained of testing the novel theory by comparison with observations, old and new, of patiently trying it with the facts it was designed to fit, of altering and amending where discrepancies became visible.

At Frauenburg, Copernicus may be said to have first begun systematically to note and record the places of the heavenly bodies. He chose for his observatory and abode a tower still pointed out to visitors as the ‘*curia Copernicana*.’* It formed part of the fortifications by which the ecclesiastical citadel of Ernland was (as the event proved) not altogether ineffectually protected, and overlooked a spacious horizon to the north, south, and west. The Cathedral of Frauenburg stood on a gentle eminence close to the ‘*Frische Hafl*,’ an extensive sheet of nearly fresh water, connected with the Baltic by a single narrow channel, and separated from it by a ridge of blown sand known as the ‘*Nehrung*.’ From a species of terrace adjacent to the ‘*Copernican tower*,’ the eye wandered undisturbed across the blue expanse of this species of inland sea (327 square miles in area) to the white dunes beyond, and, in clear weather, even to the azure line of the Baltic; while on the landward side a faintly undulating plain stretched south as far as the eye could see, well wooded and watered, rich with cornfields and meadows, and enlivened by cheerful homesteads;

* Humboldt has shown (‘*Cosmos*,’ vol. ii. p. 685, Otté’s trans.) on the authority of Voigt, that the waterworks at Frauenburg, the construction of which is traditionally ascribed to Copernicus, cannot have been begun until twenty-eight years after his death. No less apocryphal are the supposed relics of his ingenuity at Allenstein. See Prowe, Th. ii. p. 130.

the view on the east side alone being interrupted by the rusty-red brick gable of the pinnacled cathedral. It was here that Copernicus set up his 'Triquetrum,'* an instrument for taking the altitudes of the stars, constructed by himself, according to Ptolemaic precepts, of three strips of deal marked in ink with numerous divisions. Aided by this rude implement, which afforded, with the utmost care, a degree of accuracy at least 2,400 times inferior to that at the command of modern astronomers,† he effected the most complete and surprising scientific revolution known in the history of human progress.

It was soon discovered, however, that he possessed other gifts besides those needed for star-gazing, and that his clear judgment and strong sense could be made eminently useful in practical affairs. Nor does he seem to have raised any objection to the interruption of his studies. Whether from duty or inclination, services, of whatever kind they might be that were demanded of him, were no less cheerfully rendered than those of Clorinda to King Aladin:—

‘Son pronta, imponi pur, ad ogni impresa;
L’alte non temo, e l’umili non sdegno.’

Thus, he undertook and fulfilled, as ‘administrator’ of the distant capitular domains of Allenstein and Mehlsack, duties of the most heterogeneous character. He was at once bailiff, military governor, judge in civil and criminal cases, of first instance and of appeal, tax-collector, vicar-general. Some records of his daily labours in the allotment of lands have been preserved, and show the minuteness of the details with which he was obliged to be conversant. The conditions of tenure in Ermland were various and complicated. The difficulties at the best of times attending their regulation were increased tenfold by the disturbed state of the country.

Albert, Margrave of Brandenburg-Anspach, became Grand Master of the Teutonic Order in 1511. He was young, he was resolute, he had powerful relatives, he came of a race conscious of, and bent upon, a future, and he was determined, by any means that came to hand, to rescue from an anomalous and intolerable position the body of which he had assumed the

* *Alias* ‘Instrumentum parallacticum,’ or ‘Regulæ Ptolemaicæ.’ That of Copernicus was presented to Tycho Brahe in 1584, and was lost or destroyed at Prague during the Thirty Years’ War.

† Copernicus aspired to render his observations exact within *ten minutes* (of arc); good instruments may now well be depended upon (apart from unfavourable conditions) within a *quarter of a second*.

guidance. He accordingly looked round him in every direction for allies. The elastic quality of the Emperor Maximilian's pledges—

‘Lunga promessa con l’attender corto’—

became ere long discernible to him; but he thought he could reckon on his cousin at Berlin, and even upon the Grand Duke at Moscow. From both he received encouragement, from neither efficient aid. It was precisely during the period of his most active warlike preparations, 1516–19, that the first residence of Copernicus at Schloss Allenstein fell.

The nominal peace which still prevailed was attended by all the inconveniences and by many of the worst horrors of open warfare. Communications were interrupted, trade was brought to a standstill, life and property were without safeguard. The ill-paid but well-mounted mercenaries of the Order swept in robber-raids over its borders, harrying, burning, devastating; peasants fled in terror from their holdings; customary services could no longer be exacted; the ordinary conditions of peaceful country life were disturbed or destroyed. The heavy anxieties and responsibilities under these circumstances attending the situation of capitular delegate were borne by Copernicus without a murmur for no less than three years.

Scarcely had he been restored to his ordinary position in the Chapter, when war broke out in real earnest. On New Year's Day, 1520, Margrave Albert spread consternation through the diocese by seizing the important town of Braunsberg. Bishop Fabian attempted to negotiate, and it is probable, though not certain, that Copernicus was one of his envoys. But no tolerable terms could be obtained, and things had to be left to pursue their disastrous course. From its vicinity to the captured town, where a large body of Teutonic troops were maintained, Frauenburg was regarded as a highly unsafe residence, and most of the canons sought a refuge in Dantzic, Elbing, or Allenstein. Copernicus nevertheless refused to quit his tower and terrace, but calmly continued his planetary observations in the midst of disquietudes of the most urgent kind. Danger, indeed, at one moment had almost yielded its place to disaster. Loudly boasting of his intention to ravage the ecclesiastical ‘nest,’ the Teutonic commander at Braunsberg led a party to Frauenburg with a view to its realisation. Fortunately, however, the *coup de main* failed; the treasures of the ‘curia Copernicana’ were preserved to posterity; and Friedrich von Heideck was forced to content himself with working more facile mischief on farms and country-houses.

At Martinmas we find Copernicus acting once more as the representative of the Chapter at Allenstein. No more striking proof could be afforded of the confidence reposed in him by his colleagues. The war was still raging. The Castle of Allenstein was regarded as the 'antemural' of the entire diocese. Its possession was a leading object with the Grand Master. Its retention was vital to the interests, present and future, of the Chapter. And its defence had to be conducted not against foes alone. For to have committed it to Polish allies would have been hardly less perilous than to have surrendered it to Teutonic assailants. Its restoration in the one case would have been only a shade less problematical than in the other. The anxiety felt on the subject in capitular circles is vividly reflected in two letters addressed to Copernicus by one of the three canons remaining in Ernland. Had he but two coats in the world, John Scultetus assures him, he would willingly (*quam lubentissime*) give one to secure the safety of Allenstein; in lieu whereof, more effectual aid in the shape of powder and provisions, bullets and arquebuses, is proffered, with abundant exhortations to steadfastness against enemies and wariness with friends. The recent triumphant defence of Heilsberg, however, offered little encouragement to attempt a siege, and the military qualities of the astronomer consequently remained in abeyance. An armistice of four years brought to a close, April 10, 1521, the inglorious 'War of the Frankish Troopers.' Its conduct was marked by neither enterprise nor ability. Emulative atrocities were unredeemed by brilliant achievements. Devastation was simply let loose, and, when it had done its work, paused. What was called peace ensued. *Solitudinem faciunt; pacem appellant.*

On Copernicus devolved the arduous task of bringing back to its old channel the deviated current of rural existence within the capitular domains. Only to a slight extent was this possible. The larger operations of war had ceased; its minor vexations were scarcely alleviated. The mercenaries of the Order, eager to indemnify themselves for long arrears, hung like a cloud on the frontier, rendering the operations of agriculture wellnigh impracticable, unless on the distasteful *sic vos non vobis* principle. Cultivators accordingly were scarce; tenements remained forsaken. And before time had well begun to lay its soothing hand on these troubled places, Copernicus, in June, 1521, was recalled to Frauenburg, where, as 'commissary' of the diocese, he undertook new and, to us, obscure functions.

Far from obscure, however, were his political activities

during the next ten years. His name continually appears at meetings of the States of West Prussia and of Ermland; he composed the formal memorial in which the grievances of the Chapter against the Order were laid before the Diet of Graudenz, July 25, 1521; above all, he was deeply concerned in efforts for the reform of the Prussian coinage.

Never was reform more urgently needed. Successive Grand Masters had sought a no less fatal than facile exit from accumulated embarrassments by debasing the currency. The Prussian towns of Thorn, Dantzic, and Elbing, to which the privilege of separately coining money had been reserved by the Treaty of Thorn, appear not to have been behindhand in imitating the evil example. Indescribable and intolerable confusion ensued. The commerce of the country was threatened with extinction. A remedy was, on all sides, called for, and, when found, was on all sides rejected.

Copernicus, after his fashion, went to the root of the matter. He had found that no peddling cure would help the disorders of planetary theory, and he applied the lesson to the distempers of his native country. In a paper* marked by clear and sound economical views, he recommended to the Diet of Graudenz in 1522 the establishment of a single mint for the whole of Prussia, both East and West, which should issue money of a certain definite and high standard of intrinsic value. But the proposal regarded the general welfare rather than special interests, and accordingly met with little countenance. The towns clung to their noxious privilege; the bankrupt Order was unwilling or unable to replace bad money with good; the King of Poland was bent on a complete assimilation of the currency throughout his dominions. Thus nothing was done, or worse than nothing; for an edict prohibiting trade between the adjacent Prussian provinces can have only added new, without alleviating old, mischiefs.

Meantime, a serious change was looming on the political horizon. Margrave Albert had been twice admonished from Rome to reform the degenerate religious corporation of which he was the head. He went for advice on the subject to Wittenberg. The remedy for the evils complained of which Luther recommended was a drastic one. 'Dissolve the Order,'

* Disinterred from the Royal Archives of Stockholm in 1852 by Dr. Prowe. It was, like the previously mentioned memorial of grievances, composed in German; and it may be added that German was the language of the Prussian Diets until that of Lublin in 1569. (Prowe, Th. ii. p. 145.)

he counselled, 'take a wife, and found an hereditary principality.' Albert smiled inscrutably, but laid the precept to heart. Conformably to it was framed the treaty concluded at Cracow, April 8, 1525, whereby he exchanged the spiritual dignity of Grand Master for the temporal one of Duke of Prussia. The transition was effected with perfect smoothness; it had been long in preparation. Lutheran opinions were already extensively diffused among the knights; vows, once sacred, had become a burden or a mockery; and only one conspicuous member of the Order raised a protest against its dissolution.

The revolution, however, brought no mitigation of economic difficulties. The currency question came up for discussion year after year; at one Diet after another the unanswerable arguments of Copernicus were reiterated; resolutions were passed, edicts were issued, of which the attempted enforcement added to the confusion. The last glimpse we catch of the matter is in 1530, when the Frauenburg astronomer still occupies the foreground, though having left far behind his last hope of bringing it to a successful issue. It was evidently one for the strong hand to deal with.

Copernicus might with great probability have attained, had he aspired to, the episcopate; but he appears to have been totally devoid of personal ambition. His colleagues, however, showed their belief in his fitness to wield the crozier by electing him to the office of Administrator-general of the diocese during a seven months' interregnum following on the death of Bishop Fabian, January 30, 1523. It was a most critical time. The independence of Ermland was menaced both from the Polish and from the Teutonic side, and moral vigour was sorely needed to come to the rescue of material helplessness. This Copernicus displayed in ample measure. He not only obtained from King Sigismund an edict for the restoration of all places in Ermland occupied by Polish troops during the war, but—what was probably more difficult—secured its execution. The lawless forces of the Order, on the other hand, both kept (for the time) what they had got, and, when occasion offered, seized more. It has further, by diligent enquiry, been ascertained that in the years 1524, 1526, 1531, and 1538, Copernicus acted as 'nuncius capituli,' or itinerant inspector of the secular possessions of the Chapter, and that, under the title of 'visitator,' he filled the same office in purely ecclesiastical matters in December, 1535. So much has been briefly transmitted to us; and we know that the record must be incomplete. It is, however, amply sufficient to excite our

amazement when we consider that these evidences of lifelong familiarity with affairs, sometimes momentous, sometimes minutely vexatious, always exacting, refer to a man who accomplished, alone and unaided, one of the greatest and most laborious works that ever quitted the factory of the human brain.

And all this time we have left out of sight his medical capacity. Yet he was a physician in high repute, and active if not constant practice during a period of close upon thirty years. Gassendi tells us* that he was 'regarded as another *Æsculapius*,' and interprets the phrase (possibly upon traditional authority) to signify a special dedication of his skill to the service of the poor. The gloss, however, must be taken on trust; for documentary evidence naturally regards only his more distinguished patients. Even within the Chapter his prescriptions were a matter of course, and, as a matter of course, were left unrecorded; but the memory of episcopal maladies has in some cases survived. Letters demanding his instant presence at Heilsberg are even now extant, the hot haste of suffering still legible in their hurried lines; he was repeatedly at Löbau in attendance on the Bishop of Culm, and the wide reach of his fame as a healer was attested by a summons to Königsberg.

Notwithstanding his heretical proceedings, Duke Albert of Prussia remained on the best terms with the strictly Catholic ecclesiastics of Ermland. Bishop Dantiscus,† one of the most accomplished men of his time, and one of the most earnest in combating the new opinions, kept up a confidential correspondence with him; and the Chapter, whether from policy or goodwill, showed, on occasion, the utmost readiness to oblige him. Thus, when the Duke wrote in much distress, April 6, 1541, to implore the aid of the capitular physician for a trusted counsellor who lay dangerously ill, 'Doctor Nicholas' was not only despatched to Königsberg without delay, but his absence was permitted to extend over nearly a month, and that too at the time of Easter. His treatment was so far successful that the sick man lived two years longer; indeed, his patients seem, as a rule, to have thriven in his hands. Yet, so far as we are able to judge of his practice from his principles, the fact is one to occasion some surprise.

* '*Vita Copernici*,' p. 39. Gassendi took the statement from Starowolski, who took it from Bishop Gysius. See Prowe, Th. i. p. 294.

† So called from Dantzic, the place of his birth.

Amongst the fortunate discoveries of Dr. Prowse at Upsala were some of the medical works once in constant use by Copernicus for purposes of reference and consultation. Some of them exhibit, on fly-leaf or cover, recipes copied by his hand, and, we may therefore presume, approved by his experience. We thus gain a very fair insight into his views as to the treatment of disease. They may be described as those introduced by Avicenna five hundred years previously, and followed as the 'canon' of the Western schools until Leoniceus in Italy, and Linacre in England (both contemporaries of the Frauenburg physician), raised the standard of revolt against the 'Sheik Reyes' (prince of leeches), in the name of Galen and Hippocrates. In most places, however, and certainly on the banks of the Vistula, the Arab pharmacopœia held its ground for some time longer. Very characteristic of it is a recipe to which Copernicus must have attached some importance, since he took the trouble of copying it twice—on the cover of his Euclid, as well as on the fly-leaf of a 'Chirurgia.' It exhibits the multiplicity of ingredients (some of them better placed in a witches' cauldron than in an apothecary's gallipot), and the incoherent jumble of rare or precious substances, fancifully endowed with curative efficacy, which caused the druggists' trade to flourish during the long reign of Ibn Sina. We have the gold and silver, the sandal wood and Armenian earth, the pearls and precious stones which he first introduced to the familiar acquaintance of man's internal economy; with scraped and burnt ivory, the *horn of a unicorn*, the 'bone' of a stag's heart, mixed with spices and medicinal herbs, and all compounded with a *quantum suff.* of sugar. We can only hope that this highly recondite remedy was but sparingly employed, and that its costliness proved a bar to its destructiveness.

It may indeed be hopefully conjectured that Copernicus dealt chiefly in the less pretentious nostrums which find a modest place in the same collection; nor should he be held responsible for the follies of a certain *Regimen sanitatis* to which he (rashly, as regards his credit with posterity) appended his name. He undoubtedly believed in medical astrology, but he believed in it on grounds which had at least the semblance of rationality. The influence of the stars on the course of disease recognised by him was of what we should now call a meteorological character—it was exercised, not immediately, but through changes produced in the state of the atmosphere.* But it is scarcely credible that he should have

* A copy of Stöfler's Ephemerides preserved at Pulkowa, which

been imposed upon by such ignorant dogmatism as that of the 'Regimen' above mentioned, which menaces, prognosticates, and prescribes in complete exemption from the constraints of reason, and implicit reliance upon popular fatuity. The varying significance of thunder throughout the year, as regards human destinies, the weather, and the crops, is carefully expounded; certain *dies nefasti* are singled out in each month, on which bloodletting will infallibly prove fatal; we are warned not to expect long to survive a wound received, or a potion drunk, on April 1; we are instructed to eat parsley- and fennel-seed each day in March, to take for supper in June zedoary, betony, and agrimony, and to avoid tasting lake-fish or potherbs in July.* The mere fact that these and other similar imbecilities should have been deemed worthy of preservation in writing by one of the most esteemed physicians of his time and country is curiously instructive, especially when we remember who and what that physician was.

There is reason to believe that the position of Copernicus in the Chapter became less agreeable as time went on. One by one his early friends dropped off, and a new generation of a totally different stamp arose. A great religious revolution had in the meantime passed over Germany. From the Alps to the Baltic, the doctrines of Luther had been received either with open acclamation, with tacit approval, or with mild dissent. Those who remained true to the old teachings clung to the hope that by charity and patience they might still win back the wanderers, and maintain the unity of the Church. Amongst these was Copernicus. He has, it is true, left no direct record of his theological opinions; but it was by his advice that the 'Antilogikon' of Bishop Gysius, one of his most intimate friends, was published. The conciliatory spirit which pervades this work was better suited to win esteem for the author than to meet the fierce exigencies of the time. It appealed to the reason of men, while taking little account of their passions; yet we all know that by the whirlwind of their passions the mass of mankind are swept across great epochs of change.

As the quarrel became more visibly irreconcilable, sterner counsels, distasteful to the older and more tolerant school, began inevitably to prevail. Distrust and estrangement made themselves felt; the past easy life was gone for ever; and the

Copernicus annotated with his own hand, affords clear evidence of his views on this subject. See M. Curtze, 'Ueber eine Copernicus-Handschrift,' 1873.

* J. Hipler, 'Kopernikus und Luther,' pp. 68-70.

long-relaxed bonds of discipline were not drawn tighter without causing some uneasy rubs in the process. Even the Chapter had its black sheep, and with this black sheep—one Alexander Scultetus—Copernicus was accused of undue intimacy. To the delicately conveyed remonstrances of Bishop Dantiscus on the subject he however submitted, though not, it would seem, without reluctance; and Scultetus eventually succeeded in clearing himself at Rome from the charges brought against him at Frauenburg. But the incident must have been in every respect a painful one.

A fresh source of scientific sympathy was, however, opened late and unexpectedly to the great astronomer. In the early summer of 1539, a traveller rode up to the gate of the cathedral-close, and asked to see Canon Nicholas Copernicus. He was unknown, and (so far as can be ascertained) without recommendation of any sort; moreover, he came from Wittenberg, the metropolis of heresy; he followed the spiritual guidance of Luther, and was deeply indebted to the temporal patronage of Melancthon. Nevertheless, the hospitable warmth of his reception encouraged him to prolong his stay for above two years, and inspired the glowing eulogy of Prussia, its rulers, ecclesiastical and civil, the products of its soil, and the high culture of its inhabitants, appended to the 'Narratio Prima.'* George Joachim von Lauchen—usually styled 'Rheticus' from the situation of his birth-place—was born at Feldkirch in the Vorarlberg (near the borders of the ancient Rhætia) February 16, 1514. He studied at Wittenberg, wandered from one German university to another, returned to fill a mathematical chair procured for him by Melancthon, and at last, set on fire by reports concerning a new system of astronomy devised at Frauenburg, he resolved to repair thither, and enquire for himself into its merits. He was then twenty-five years of age; of an ardent, affectionate, restless disposition; eager for novelty, rapid in assimilating the thoughts of others, and generous in appraising them at their highest value. Between him and his 'preceptor' a warm attachment sprang up, and to their intercourse posterity is indebted for the publication of *De Revolutionibus orbium cœlestium*.

This memorable work was virtually finished about the year 1530. But from the irrevocable notoriety of print its author shrank with sensitive dread. He was aware that his con-

* This was the title of a preliminary sketch of the Copernican system, published by Rheticus in 1540.

clusions must be incomprehensible to most, unacceptable to wellnigh all. The long processes of laborious thought by which he had convinced himself that the motions of the heavenly bodies could only be rendered intelligible by being shown to be in large measure apparent, were not such as could profitably be followed by the ignorant, the impatient, or the prepossessed. Yet he knew that a vast majority even of the reading public were all three. He thus laid deeply to heart the Pythagorean maxims of reticence, and, while not unwilling to communicate the bare results of his theory, he resolved to entrust the principles from which those results were derived to the exclusive guardianship of an esoteric few. It was for this purpose that he wrote the '*Commentariolus*,' a short popular account of the new system, of which a few copies were circulated in manuscript.* These appear to have been read with no less avidity than admiration. Widmannstad, in 1533, derived from this source the substance of a lecture which Clement VII. recompensed with the gift of a rare Greek text; Calcagnini was encouraged to denounce the absurdity of attributing a diurnal rotation to the sphere; and Cardinal Schönberg transmitted to Copernicus a formal request for the full publication of his system. There was, indeed, a countercurrent. The doctrine of the earth's motion was made the subject of a farce put upon the stage at Elbing during the Carnival of 1531 or 1532; Luther pronounced it contrary to Holy Writ, and stigmatised its chief advocate as a 'fool who thought to turn the whole art of astronomy upside down;' † and Melancthon went so far as to desire the sup-

181 miles, including the length of the first stage. The total distance given by Mr. Marvin is $185\frac{1}{2}$ miles.

Sarakhs is surrounded by high walls and a deep ditch. It is occupied by one battalion (about 700 men) of Persian infantry. The fields and gardens are within the walls. The bed of the Tedjent, or Sarakhs Darien, is dry during the greater part of the year, its breadth from $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ verst, and in some places more. After a heavy fall of rain, or the thawing of snow in the mountains, the lower course of the Tedjent to the northward of Sarakhs is filled with water, as are the artificial lakes in which water is impounded for the purpose of irrigation. It was ascertained, says M. Lessar, that there was no general ascent along the whole of the surveyed route. 'At Aidan many places are below the level of the Caspian, and all the country from the coast to the wells at the former place cannot be regarded as the dry bed of a river, but as once forming an inlet of the sea, a part of which, namely that near the present coast, is being filled up with sand, while the depressions of the country beyond are being gradually levelled with the surrounding land by the destruction of the greater and smaller Balkans.'

In April 1882 M. Lessar revisited the Attek country, through which his first journey had been made in November and December 1881. In the interval much change had taken place, owing, he says, to the fact that

'the relation between the Russians and the Tékke Turcomans and the neighbouring hostile tribes had been clearly defined. The assault of Geok-Tépé, on January $\frac{1}{2}$, 1881, closed the military operations in the Transcaspian region, and put an end to all resistance in the Akhal country. A considerable part of the population that had fled to Merv and the Tedjent during the war, and after the storming of Geok-Tépé, would not venture to return to their former places of abode, notwithstanding the proclamation of a complete amnesty.'

'The migration back of the Tekes to their former dwelling places commenced in the month of September, and served as a signal for the pacification of the region. In the month of February 1882, a caravan carrying letters, prints, &c., of the Russian merchant Koushin, had succeeded in penetrating even to Merv.'

Of the impression produced on the inhabitants of the district by the approach of the Russian power M. Lessar took advantage, when requiring attendants for travelling along the Hari-Rud, and through the Saryk encampment. While the Russian traveller may now expect to meet no difficulty from local authorities, it is however proper, as matter of precaution, for him to have a sufficient escort to set at defiance any of those

robber hands that still exist among the different tribes. M. Lessar obtained from the elders of the Kaakhka settlement twenty well-mounted Alieli Turcomans, armed to the teeth.

In this second journey, M. Lessar, while to some extent repeating his former remarks, gives an account of the distribution of water and inhabited places from Askabad to Sarakhs which it may be useful to summarise in a note. As the English mileage is given by the translator of this letter, together with the distance in Russian versts, we will confine our extracts to the former and more familiar mode of reckoning.*

Thus over the whole extent of country from Baba Durmaz

* Annau, $8\frac{2}{3}$ miles from Askabad, containing 200 tents, is supplied with water by the river Keltechinar, which flows from the Zyry-ku range. It belongs to Russia, and there is no difficulty as to water.

At Gawers, $13\frac{1}{8}$ miles from Annau, and at Baba Durmaz, $25\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Gawers, there are no inhabitants. Two streams, flowing through Russian territory, the latter being slightly brackish, are available for this distance.

Artyk, $10\frac{2}{3}$ miles from Baba Durmaz, contains 20 tents. It is supplied with water by the Dnrangiar river, which waters the whole fertile Deregez valley, and is lost in several small lakes into which it expands beyond Artyk.

Lutfabad and Kuren, at $3\frac{1}{3}$ miles from Artyk, and the settlements which frequently cover them as far as Kaakhka, are supplied with water by the Rud-Khan, or Rudbar river, which flows from the Allah-Ekber mountains. This is the finest river in the whole Attek, and its water turns the whole district into a fertile oasis. About 500 tents are distributed along the road at twelve points. The settlements are surrounded by gardens, and the fields under cultivation are of greater extent than elsewhere.

Kaakhka, at $18\frac{2}{3}$ miles from Lutfabad, is the largest settlement in the Attek, and consists of 650 tents. It is supplied with water by the Lain and Archinyan rivers, which issue from the mountains near Kelat and unite in the plain at Kaakhka. At Naurek settlement, in the gorge above the ruins of Hodjamed, $11\frac{1}{3}$ miles from Kaakhka, are about twenty tents, but the stream which supplies them with water only reaches the spot in the spring.

At 14 miles from Hodjamed is Dushak, or Chardir, consisting of 160 tents. It is situated on the Chardir river, which runs through the whole of Kelat, and supplies it with water.

Meana, at $29\frac{1}{3}$ miles from Dushak, consisting of 130 tents, and Chantcha, $10\frac{2}{3}$ miles from Meana, containing seventy tents, are supplied with water by two parallel streams from the Kelat mountains. From Chantcha to Sarakhs, a distance of $36\frac{2}{3}$ miles, there is no water. At the mid-way are the ruins of Rabat Abdullah Khan, where a cistern of rain-water formerly existed. But during the dominion of the Tekés Rabat was destroyed, and the cistern is now filled with earth.

to Sarakhs (exclusive of Lutfabad and Shilgan, which are inhabited by Persians), there is a population of about seven thousand Aliele Tureomans and Tekkes, reckoning on an average five souls to a tent. These figures, however, change from day to day, as it is only at Küren and Kaakhka that a settled population exists. Nor can any great increase of the inhabitants be expected, as agriculture, their sole means of support, is entirely dependent on irrigation, and the supply of water available for that purpose is too limited to allow of much more land being brought under cultivation. The density (if such it can be called) of population over the whole area is less than two souls per square mile. When we calculate how small is the interval that divides such a rate of inhabitation from utter desert, and farther note the difficult and precarious nature of the measures on which any increase of cultivation in the districts must depend, we can only regard this portion of Russia's route to Herat as so much geographical distance; requiring, indeed, a disproportionate charge for the guarding and protection of any future line of railway, but affording none of that local traffic on the existence of which the self-supporting character of such an enterprise must mainly depend.

The district over which we have thus been enabled to throw a bird's-eye glance is indeed only a small portion of the route from the Caspian to the Indus. It may be of use to give the distances in a concise form. They are as follows:—

				Total.
From Michailovsky	to Kizil Arvat	144 miles		144 miles.
„ Kizil Arvat	„ Askabad	135 „		279 „
„ Askabad	„ Sarakhs	185.5 „		464.5 „
„ Sarakhs	„ Herat	202.5 „		667 „
„ Herat	„ Sibi	599 „		1,266 „
„ Sibi	„ Shikapoor	133 „		1,399 „

From Michailovsky, on the Caspian, to Kizil Arvat the railway is laid. It can only be regarded as a military work. 'The expanse' through which it runs 'has the appearance of a wilderness, and either has no water at all, or water of a very bad quality' ('The Russians at Merv,' p. 14). From Kizil Arvat to Bami (the distance of which is not given), the country is said to be fruitful and full of water; and from Bami to Askabad 'it contains a soil of such fertility that the Turcomans have a saying that 'Adam, driven from Eden, never found a finer place for settlement than the Akhal.' The route from Askabad to Sarakhs we have already described. For the road from Sarakhs to Herat, of which M. Lessar's account is contained in an extract from the 'Golos' of Sept. 7¹₃ and 7⁴₆,

1882, we must refer the reader to the Parliamentary paper mentioned at the head of our article. The population along the route is not stated; but the general idea given of it is not that of a country much more thickly inhabited than that existing in the former parts of the route. In 1832, Barnes found the bed of the Hari-Rud at Sarakhs quite dry; but when the dam across the river above Herat is destroyed the stream leaves its banks and inundates the surrounding country. It terminates in morasses, which become dry in summer. The road to India does not lie up the valley in which Herat is situated; but, in order to accomplish the distance from that city to the mouth of the Bolan Pass (which, as the crow flies, is but little over four hundred miles), it makes a circuit of six hundred miles, round the foot of the mountains, and by the valley of the Helmund river. Information as to the district is wanting, but it contains the swamps and salt marshes that fringe the Scistan Lake. However available the first section of this line may have been or may be in aiding Russia to put a stop to the mutual extermination of the wild Turcoman tribes, the main course of the proposed route is singularly destitute of any resources that could support a railway. Thus, neither as developing local wealth, nor as affording an outlet for any remunerative traffic, does there appear to be the slightest inducement for the construction of 1,200 miles of railway through the Akhal and Afghanistan. That some slight local advantages might be secured, at a heavy imperial cost, is the utmost that can be said for the project, if regarded from any but a strategic point of view. It may, therefore, be well to inquire into the actual capacity of such a line for the purposes of military aggression.

It should, however, be first noted that the existing Transcaucasian railway, from the completion of which the chief arguments in favour of a Transcaspian line have been derived, differs widely from the latter in the fact that it commands a local traffic of a magnitude which it is not possible adequately to convey over the steep incline of the Suram Pass. The extreme importance of the development of this traffic must be our excuse for dwelling, in some detail, on the facts now for the first time brought before us.

The discovery and development of an apparently boundless supply of petroleum in the neighbourhood of Baku, on the western shore of the Caspian, is one of those unforeseen events of which it is difficult rightly to estimate the vast importance. In a lecture before the Royal Geographical Society on the country of the Tekke Turcomans, in 1881, Colonel Stewart said:—

‘Baku, which I remember as quite a small place, has now more than 30,000 inhabitants, and has, I believe, a great future before it. The unlimited supply of petroleum, which is here found, is a mine of wealth. As soon as railways are made, I believe that Baku will supply the world with petroleum. The price is now only a halfpenny per pood of 36 lbs. on the spot, and the supply is practically unlimited. All the steamers on the Caspian already use it as fuel instead of coal, and I believe the use of petroleum as fuel will soon be extended to the railways also. Some locomotive engines already burn petroleum.’

Petroleum has been found in many places in the Russian Empire. It abounds in the middle part of the course of the Volga, and in the Kouban region, close to the Sea of Azof; and natural petroleum wells are scattered over many parts of the Caucasus. Mr. O'Donovan, whose lively record of travels and adventures in the Merv Oasis in the years 1879–80–81 we recently reviewed, says: ‘All around Baku the ground is sodden with natural issues of naphtha. In some places the earth is converted into a natural asphalt, hard during the cold weather, but into which the foot sinks a couple of inches at mid-day in summer.’ North of the town of Baku the shore of the Caspian trends toward the east, and at the respective distances of about ten and twelve miles occur the naphtha springs of Balak Nancé and Sula Khané, in a neighbourhood as bare of vegetation as is that swept by the sulphurous fumes of the copper works at Swansea. The subterranean wealth is sought for by means of boring, as in this country we seek for water or for coal. Iron bars of eight or ten feet in length are so formed that they can be connected together at will, and a ‘bit,’ or cutting tool, is fixed at the end of the compound rod. A rude staging is generally erected, so that the movement of the boring tool, by means of a long cross-handle, also readily fixed or unfixed on the bar, is more under control than it can be by workmen standing on the ground. The depth at which the oil may be struck is very uncertain, borings made within forty or fifty yards of each other sometimes varying as much as from fifty to one hundred or one hundred and fifty yards in depth. The greatest difficulty experienced by the borer is when he strikes on a boulder stone, which will sometimes yield to the tool and be pushed aside, returning to close the hole when the rod is withdrawn.

The borings of Baku are said to be of from ten to eighteen inches in diameter. In successful cases, after a preliminary discharge of light carburetted hydrogen gas, inflammable by contact with a light, the naphtha rises to the surface like water in an artesian well, or may even spring in a fountain for eight or

ten feet into the air. In those cases channels have to be dug to lead the copious supply of oil into an appropriate reservoir. Under more ordinary circumstances, as the petroleum has to be pumped or drawn up in a bucket, a tube closed at the bottom is lowered into the borehole until the top of it is below the level of the fluid, and is then drawn up as a long and capacious bucket. The oil thus extracted is described as a bluish-pink transparent liquid. It is poured into a trough or channel rudely constructed of wood, at the door of the well-house, and thus conducted to the distillery. The distillation commences at the comparatively low temperature of 140° Fahr., and the heat is successively increased, by ten degrees at a time, as the naphtha ceases to flow from the still. The best quality of petroleum, that used for lamps, is obtained from the third distillation; that which precedes it being of secondary quality, and the first or most volatile product being either thrown away, or used to adulterate the second and third qualities. The refuse remaining after the third distillation is a dark brown fluid, resembling treacle, and is called *Astatki* (refuse) or *Neftiani Astatki* (petroleum refuse) by the Russians. The price of the *Astatki* at Baku is merely nominal, and much of it is thrown into the sea. But its value as fuel is of a high order, and it is said to give four times as great a volume of gas as can be obtained from an equal weight of coal. The boilers of the steamers on the Caspian are now heated by this fuel. The apparatus for burning it consists of two tubes, each about an inch in diameter, which are made to terminate at the same point in a small chamber. The petroleum refuse is allowed to trickle through one tube, and is blown into spray by a jet of steam which is suffered to escape from the other. The ignited spray forms a great sheet of flame, which enwraps the bottom of the boiler. The system has the advantage of great facility of application, as well as of cheapness. No stoking is required. No ashes are produced. The flame can be regulated by turning a tap, and can be readily turned down when not required; and the boiler yet kept ready for immediate starting, without any need for banking up the fire.

The distilled petroleum is placed in a reservoir, in which a sort of paddle-wheel is made to revolve. Sulphuric acid is added, and the liquor being allowed to settle after agitation, the upper portion is drawn off, and treated with caustic potash, after which it is ready for sale. Much, no doubt, remains to be done in the way of utilising the whole of the native oil. Gas for lighting is produced from the refuse, and a lubricant for

machinery of much value is also distilled from the *astatki*, treated with an alkali.

The existence of this mineral wealth in the basin of the Caspian has been long known, although it is only since 1872 that measures have been taken by the Russian Government for rapid development of this industry. Outside the harbour of Baku a small bay is reached, about a mile to the south, where the smooth surface of the sea is rippled by several eddies, like diminutive whirlpools. On casting a lighted wisp of straw into one of these eddies, not the Thames, but the Caspian is set on fire. The volatile naphtha, rising through fourteen feet of salt water, burns as brilliantly as a cauldron of tar. The author of '*A Journey through the Caucasus and Persia*,' who describes this adventure, says: 'From one eddy we rowed to another, and fired the sea in a dozen places. The effect of this union of two such opposite elements—a union which, were there no wind, would never be dissolved—was strikingly beautiful and strange, especially as, on the night in question, there was not a breath of air to disturb its duration.'

The province of Baku was acquired from Persia by Peter the Great in 1723; and that astute and provident sovereign gave special instructions for extracting the oil, and sending it up the Volga to Russia. The district was ceded to Persia by the Empress Anne in 1735; but recovered by Russia in 1806, and converted into a crown domain in 1813. From this date to 1872 the extraction of petroleum was a monopoly farmed out to a merchant named Meerzoeff, who only possessed one set of works, and who charged a heavy price for the article. From 1832 to 1850 the average production was a million gallons of crude petroleum in a year. From 1850 to 1863 the production rose to 2,500,000 gallons a year. In 1859 the system of boring for oil was accidentally discovered in Pennsylvania; but Meerzoeff made no attempt to avail himself of this discovery, which was made by Captain Drake. Thus, while in 1862 the production of petroleum in Russia was not more than we have stated, the output in America in that year was as much as 100,000,000 gallons.

In 1872 the Russian Government turned its attention to the subject of competing with the United States for supplying the markets of the world with petroleum. A survey was then made of the Baku oil district; and the total area was computed at 1,200 square miles. A large portion of this land belonged to the crown. Of this 270 acres were granted to certain high officials; General Lazareff, who stormed Kars in

1878, receiving ten acres, which were estimated to be worth several thousand pounds. Upwards of 1,800 acres were sold by auction to different parties, for about 300,000*l*. Other parts were let at about 7*s*. 6*d*. per acre. The industry being thus thrown open to free competition, boring was at once resorted to; and in the first year, 1873, the production rose from 212,000 to 500,000 barrels. In 1874 the output reached 620,000 barrels, and in 1875 upwards of 850,000 barrels, or 4,250,000 gallons.

It is not, however, enough to place the petroleum in a magazine, ready for sale. The cost of carriage to the centres of consumption is a matter for consideration of no less importance than the expense of extraction from the earth. The oil had first to be conveyed a distance of eight or nine miles to the refineries, situated on the water's edge. This transport was effected in the rudest manner, the liquid being ladled from the reservoirs into tumbrils, and then carted to the 'black town' of Baku. There it was converted into kerosine, and filled into barrels, which were manufactured, at a high cost, on the Volga. The full barrels were sent by steamers from Baku to the stations at the mouth of the Volga, where they were transhipped into steamers of lighter draught, and conveyed up the river to Tsaritzin. Here they were unloaded and carted to the railway station; and thence despatched, at exorbitant rates, to various parts of Russia. The oil cart then in use is described as being a vehicle no less peculiar than those well-known Neapolitan *corricoli* which never wear out, for the reason that the construction of new vehicles of the pattern having been prohibited by a law of Carlo Terzo, the life of the aged vehicles is rendered perennial by adroit repairs and replacements. A little railed cart, large enough to hold a single barrel, is perched so high above a pair of 7-feet wheels, that a second barrel is slung beneath the floor. The whole construction is gaudily painted; and its creaking progress is maintained by a diminutive horse, of which the back is hardly on the level of the axle of the wheels. As much as 100,000*l*. a year was expended on this primitive mode of transport.

The introduction of a method more in accordance with the engineering science of the day for the carriage of the Caspian petroleum to market is due to the brothers Nobel, Swedes by birth, who were brought to Russia when boys by their father. Ludwig Nobel conceived the idea of organising on a large scale a thorough system of transport. For the carts, or tumbrils, used for conveying the oil to the refineries, he proposed to substitute pipes, leading to iron reservoirs. The kerosine, when prepared, he proposed to pump direct into floating

cisterns, or steamers fitted with tanks, which should go direct to Tsaritzin. There arrived, the oil was again to be pumped into reservoirs, and thence into tank cars, fitted for railway carriage. But neither oil owners, steamship owners, nor railway proprietors met the proposal with approval. The Caucasus and Mercury Company refused to fit their steamers with tanks, and the Griaze-Tsaritzin Railway Company declined to add tank cars to their rolling stock.

Ludwig Nobel, however, was not a man to be daunted by opposition. Being able to find a considerable sum of money himself, he obtained from other capitalists a sufficient addition to his own resources to enable him to form, as a joint-stock enterprise, 'the Petroleum Producing Company of the Brothers Nobel.' The capital required for a thorough completion of the original plan was upwards of 1,380,000*l.*; the sea-going steamers costing 27,500*l.* each, the river steamers 13,500*l.* each, and the tank cars 200*l.* each. Twenty steamers for the Volga were ordered in Russia, twenty for the Caspian in Sweden, and several hundreds of tank cars from various makers. Several years were spent in establishing the organisation; and although the capital of the company now amounts to 800,000*l.*, on which a dividend of 8 per cent. was paid in 1881, the whole of Ludwig Nobel's plans are yet far from being realised. The company now possess about a dozen oil-carrying steamers on the Caspian, and some thirty river steamers on the Volga. They have chartered thirty steamers specially constructed for the purpose of conveying the naphtha refuse across the Caspian to the Volga, the Persian ports, and other points. They possess enormous reservoirs both at Baku and at Tsaritzin, as well as special stations at St. Petersburg and other places; and they run 1,400 tank cars on the railways of Russia.

In 1873, when boring for oil first commenced at Baku, seventeen wells were sunk. The total number exceeded 375 at the date of the last accounts; and new ones are added at the rate of sixty or seventy per year. The deepest well is 637 feet; the average depth about 350 feet; the cost of sinking something under a pound a foot. Flowing wells yield from 80,000 to 160,000 gallons of oil per day; pumping wells from 1,200 to 2,400 gallons. The cost of the oil, which in 1872 stood at about 8*s.* per barrel of forty gallons, has fallen to about 4*d.* for the same quantity. The production of petroleum in Pennsylvania is stated to have risen from 100,000,000 gallons in 1862 to 1,450,000,000 gallons in 1881. The latter was above nine times the Russian output for that year. Of

kerosine 58,000,000 gallons were exported from Baku, in 1881, against 280,000,000 gallons exported in the same year from Pennsylvania.*

The chief drawback to the success of the Baku export trade in petroleum and its productions is the closing of the inland waterways, owing to the freezing of the Volga, the Neva, and the intersecting canals, for nearly half the year. This difficulty has been a spur to the construction of the Transcaucasian Railway, from Baku to Batoum on the Black Sea, a distance of 562 miles. Now that the line is completed, the railway company is bound to carry the oil from Baku to Poti or Batoum for a little under a penny per gallon, and from Baku to Tiflis for half that charge. It is expected that the consequence of the arrangement will be that the Baku petroleum will drive the American oil out of the Caucasian market, and maintain a struggle with it in the markets of the Black Sea and the Mediterranean.

A drawback to the utility of the Transcaucasian Railway as the medium of transport is found in its severe gradients. In the section of forty miles in length between the Michailovsky and the Kviritsky stations, on the Tiflis-Batoum line, the road has to traverse the Suram Pass, at an elevation of 2,000 feet above those points, or 3,500 feet above the level of the sea. Here, while the locomotives in use on the line can draw a train of twenty-two tank cars, containing 66,000 gallons of oil, over the more level portions of the line, the same power will only draw a train of six cars over the pass. It is therefore computed that the railway cannot be expected to convey more than 40,000,000 gallons of oil in the year. The stipu-

* The fluctuations in price attending on the introduction of this new supply have been naturally very great. From 1870 to 1879 the price of kerosine at Baku was raised from 3*d.* to 1*s.* 8*d.* per gallon. In America, at the same time, the variation was from 1*d.* to 10*d.* per gallon. In March 1883 kerosine was sold in Baku at 1*d.* per gallon. The price of kerosine delivered at Tsaritzin is stated at present at about 3·6*d.* per gallon. To compete effectually with America the price must be reduced to 2·1*d.* per gallon. At the great fair at Nijni Novogorod, in 1882, Baku kerosine fetched from 5·3*d.* to 5·7*d.* per gallon; the cost of transport from Baku amounting to between four and five times as much as the sale price at the refineries in that town. For crude petroleum, the cost of carriage to the great fair amounted to fourteen times that of the article itself at Baku. The specific gravity of the crude petroleum varies from 0·780 to 0·890. It yields, on an average, 33 per cent. of kerosine, while American petroleum yields 70 per cent. The ordinary gravity of Baku kerosine is 0·819, and the fire test is 30° centigrade.

lated price of the transport of oil on the Transcaucasian line comes to about 18 per cent. less than the normal cost of transport on the Russian railways, so that there is a struggle between the political and the commercial interests which it is proposed to serve by the establishment of this low tariff, which can hardly be ultimately determined in favour of the former.*

It is proposed to extend the use of the method by which petroleum is now brought from the wells to the refineries at Baku, to the conveyance of that fluid across the Caucasus. An American projector, in 1878, proposed to lay a pipe for the whole distance of 562 miles from the Caspian to the Black Sea. But the stipulation that the Government should concede a verst of land, in blocks, on each side of the pipe, proved fatal to the scheme. A later project has been suggested for laying a pipe alongside the railway from Baku to Batoum, the estimated cost being 1,750,000*l.*, or rather under 3,000*l.* per mile. The confidence of commercial men, that the transport of this important commodity will, in some way or other, be maintained at a very low price, is shown by the fact that an extensive refinery has been recently established at Batoum, fitted up with English machinery, and that others are projected by Russian capitalists. And a French company, with an adequate capital, is said to have recently erected refineries at Marseilles for extracting kerosine from Baku petroleum. By the utilisation of the whole substance of the crude oil, as gas, kerosine, fuel, lubricant, and perhaps other objects of utility, it seems probable that it may be rendered worth while to import it into France, or even into England, in properly constructed vessels, in its native state.

This new mine of untold wealth on the borders of the Caspian, however, so far from affording any stimulus for the

* The Russian railway charges, if we may depend on the figures cited by Mr. Marvin from Gospodin Poletica, whom he states to be an authority on the matter, are much higher than those on the English railways. The average cost of running a train for a mile in the United Kingdom, in 1878, was a little under three shillings; that of a train in Russia for the same distance comes to 5*s.* 9*d.* At this rate there is a steady loss of 21 per cent. on the carriage of petroleum at the price fixed by the Government. On the English trunk lines from London, according to evidence laid before the Select Committee on Railways (226 I. 1881), the charge for carrying coals comes to one-third of a penny per ton per mile, with the addition of a terminal charge of 1*s.* 10*d.* On the Transcaucasian line the rate fixed for carriage of petroleum is $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* per ton per mile, with a terminal charge of 1*s.* 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ *d.* per ton. And at this price, as we have seen, the loss is considerable.

construction of a railway to the Indus (further than as supplying a cheaper fuel than is at present available for the locomotive), only brings into stronger relief the real knot of the Eastern question. The great requirement of the Russian Empire, from the point of view of its material prosperity, is the provision of a sea outlet for its communication, that shall be independent of interruption by the rigours of winter. That outlet, for geographical reasons, can only be through the waters of the Euxine; hence the strong impulse—independent of any dynastic or strategic reasons—which has for so long a time bent the national desires towards Constantinople. Apart from the sentimental motives—the dreams of the restored empire of the East, and of a neo-Greek emperor crowned at St. Sophia—the material objection entertained to the existence, on the Bosphorus, of a hostile Mohammedan rule that can bar the issue of Russian trade to the Mediterranean, is one of those secular forces with which Europe has undoubtedly to reckon.

Nor does it seem consistent with the physical conditions of the case to imagine that such an outlet could be secured by Russia—were there no military opponent to be met with—by the way either of the Indus or of the Ganges. Were the centre of gravity of the Russian Empire so far displaced as to render such a commercial arrangement possible, matters would stand in a very different position from that which they now occupy. But there is a limit to land transport far more narrow than any which attends on ocean commerce. That limit is fixed by actual cost of transport. It is one thing to run, for strategic, for administrative, or even for commercial objects, a long line of railway to connect the metropolis of a country with its frontiers, or even to bridge a continent, teeming with new settlers, as in North America, and quite another to project a long line of railway for military and commercial purposes, through barren and unproductive deserts, or wild and unsettled robber territories. From Michailovsky on the Caspian to Sibi, to which latter point our Indian lines of railway extend, we now know to be no less than 1,266 miles; and Michailovsky, even if it were connected by railway with St. Petersburg, is at a distance of more than 1,600 miles from that capital. Chains so extended are liable to break by their own weight. In no whit are they strong enough to bear the tension of regular use, either for the purposes of military aggression, or for those of commercial outlet and inlet. Taking the line from the Caspian towards the Indus alone, as far as our present experience of the railway system—now some fifty

years old—goes, the very lowest price at which it would be possible to convey a ton of merchandise, even if as cheaply carried as coal or as petroleum, over that distance, would be from 35s. to 40s. And that would allow for no interest in the cost of construction of the railway. For commercial purposes, therefore—that is to say, as the means of conveyance to extensive markets of a great export and import trade—such a railway would be of very little utility. Local traffic, we have seen, there can be none to mention in the case of the line here indicated, for years to come; and through traffic would be too costly to be practically possible. For passengers, if any need for such means of intercourse existed, the inducement might be sufficient; but for goods it is wholly out of the question. Thus, when Mr. Marvin tells us (p. 356) that ‘the deficit on the Transcaucasian Railway which the Government has to make good for the year 1882 is 4,080,000 roubles, or 408,000*l.*,’ and that ‘the total of the deficits of the railways of Russia for 1882 exceeded 15,000,000*l.*’ (a statement which must be accepted with reserve), ‘all of which has to be made good by the Government,’ he hardly supports his contention as to the credit due to General Annenkoff for having ‘given a solid character’ to a railway which such a far-seeing and clever man as Skobelev had ‘treated with very inadequate justice.’

To stretch a line, for a distance that renders passage unlikely, except for very strong and, as yet, undetermined reasons, over a country which offers no hope of local support for many years to come, is a hopeless task. We come, in such a case, face to face with substantial difficulties, topographical, engineering, and financial, to which due weight must be given by the statesman. Absolute distance is one of these difficulties. It is a physical fact of the first order, and forms a controlling element—first, in the financial; secondly, in the commercial; and thirdly, in the military, point of view. What the distances in this case are we have already indicated. It is very easy to put on paper such estimates of either past or future cost as 4,000*l.* or 5,000*l.* a mile, and to draw the sweeping conclusion that ‘we consequently see that the extension of the Russian railway system to the Key of India would cost but little over two millions sterling.’ But we doubt whether the average price of 4,200*l.* a mile thus arrived at would be sufficient to supply merely the rolling stock that would be necessary for a railway to be used as the sole line of communication with a military base of operations, without finding a single shilling for construction. The rail-

ways of India, at the end of 1875, had cost on an average 16,400*l.* per mile over their entire network. The Punjaub Railway cost 9,000*l.* per mile; the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway—the traffic on which may be regarded as bearing the nearest resemblance to the requisites of a military line under pressure of work—has spent 8,200*l.* per mile on its rolling stock alone, out of a cost of above 70,000*l.* a mile.

The 1,504 miles of the East Indian Railway had cost hard upon 20,000*l.* per mile in 1878. The State lines of India, which it was thought would be cheaper than the guaranteed lines, had cost at the same date 16,000*l.* per mile. The Euphrates Valley Railway, if laid out over ground that is, to a certain extent, known, and over a large part of which little more would be requisite than the laying down of a substantial permanent way (on the Barlow principle), is cited, on p. 379 of 'The Russians at Merv,' as involving an expenditure of eight millions sterling for 920 miles. The cost of 9,000*l.* per mile for 934 miles has been given in our own pages as an estimate for this line. The railways of the United States, which are not of that substantial character that would be required for a military railway from the Caspian to the Indus, had cost 11,629*l.* per mile at the end of 1880, over an aggregate length of 84,225 miles. There is thus great room to doubt whether, in the case of a military invasion, dependent for connexion with the base of operations on the service of a line of railway of 1,266 miles in length, with good gradients, the allowance of 4,200*l.* a mile would be sufficient to provide the working stock alone, to say nothing of the construction of the works.

A further and a very definite check on the aggressive power of Russia, in so far as this may depend on the military use of her railways, is imposed by the very features which constitute the defences of the natural eastern frontiers of the Empire. This area, indeed, may be extended beyond those frontiers (as weirs and other obstacles to the course of rivers disappear beneath the level of an overwhelming flood). But the physical difficulties remain unchanged, and their influence is of the first importance. From the bold promontory formed by the range of the Pái Khoi Mountains, in the Arctic Sea, the Ural Mountains run down to latitude 52° N. Parting from this formidable chain, the Obtehoi Mountains flank the course of the Ural river, till it reaches the vast salt swamps that lie between its channel and that of the Volga, as they approach the Caspian. It is not probable that a railway outlet can be formed across this double or triple barrier of rivers,

mountains, and morasses, more favourable than that which has been utilised on the Tiflis-Batoum line, on the Transcaucasian Railway. The Suram Pass, between the Michailovsky and the Kviritsky stations on this line is 3,500 feet, as before stated, above the sea. If the levels quoted by Mr. Marvin are correct, there is a gradient of one in fifty, or thereabouts, for twenty miles either way through this pass. And as the statement that, 'on reaching the Michailovsky station (p. 302) 'the train has to be uncoupled, and only six (out of twenty-two) tank-cars taken over the pass at a time, unless several locomotives are used,' very fairly accords with the calculable effect due to a gradient of that pitch, a wholly unintentional confirmation of the truth of the two statements is obtained. But the interposition on a long line of railway of a throttle-valve of this nature, puts a very sharp limit on the capacity of such a line for traffic. The Transcaucasian Railway 'cannot carry at the utmost more than 8,000,000 poods, or 40,000,000 gallons annually,' owing, among other causes, to these heavy gradients. The importance of the limitation of traffic thus effected is critical from the military point of view. On the whole, therefore, it may be calculated that the utility of any Transcaspien railway that requires an organic connexion with Moscow and St. Petersburg as a base, must be diminished by at least one-half as compared with the previous estimates; even if the country from Kizil Arvat to Sibi should prove to be so unexceptionally, not to say suspiciously, favourable as is held to be the case by General Annenkoff.

The question of the actual capacity of a railway to serve as the line of communication for a large invading army has never, so far as we are aware, been practically investigated in this country. It is, however, a problem which it is desirable at least approximately to solve before we allow ourselves to be influenced by any panic with reference to the danger to which our Indian Empire may be exposed by the construction of a line of railway from the basin of the Caspian to that of the Indus.

The cost of engines and vehicles for an Asiatic railway will be considerably higher than on the English lines, as the whole of the stock will have to be transported to a considerable distance. Whatever be the cost of the construction of a railway, that of the working stock necessary to perform a given amount of work can thus be correctly stated as a minimum; and in preparing for any proposed military operations, over a long line of railway, the cost will be found to be very large. On the other hand, the actual capacity for traffic of a railway is

limited by the most unfavourable portions of the line. Thus, as we have seen, the carrying capacity of the Transcaucasian Railway for petroleum is limited, according to the data collected by Mr. Marvin, to something under 1,000 tons of gross load per day. In the recent English expedition to Egypt, Lord Hartington stated in the House of Commons, on March 12, 1883, that the supplies, horses, and equipments for 24,000 troops occupied seventy transports, with a tonnage of 50,000 tons. This is a little over two tons per man, and it included forage and rations for only fourteen days. The proportionate weight of two tons per man would involve a railway movement, including return of empty vehicles, of more than five tons per man, or 250,000 tons for a force of 50,000 men. But to transport this weight over a line of railway that could with difficulty carry more than 1,000 tons per day is an operation involving eight months! And, however by the crowding on a line of a working stock out of all proportion to the ordinary service of a railway this time might be reduced, it is evident that weeks, if not months, would be necessary in order to allow of concentrations which the general requires to be effected in days. That a military expedition could be conducted by the service of a single railway, of great length, and passing over severe gradients in its course, may thus be safely asserted to be impossible.

It is, then, tolerably obvious that, however cheaply a rough line of metals, such as may serve the purposes of a barbarous country, might be laid from the Caspian towards the Indus, such a mode of opening the country would be wholly ineffective as a great tactical, and therefore as a great strategic, measure. The time of which we have spoken, as necessary to allow of the bare transport of an army from Michailovsky to Sibi is only one, although a very important, item in the question. For the whole distance the line of communication would require the most efficient guarding. The predatory hordes of whom the travellers in these regions tell us—Turcomans of various tribes, Tekkes, and Alieli; Emvali, and Kara-Dashli, the feudatories of Khorassan, the Eelkharris of Budjnurd, and of Deregez; the unwarlike, but also untrustworthy, troops and subjects of Persia; the Afghans and the Beloochees, in case of war would hang over the line of rail in swarms, feeble, it may be, individually, but extremely embarrassing from their numbers. To watch and work the railways of the United Kingdom requires a force of about seventeen men per mile. A hundred men a mile would be but a small allowance for the protection of a route of vital importance through such evil

neighbourship as we have hinted at. But such a guard would exhaust an army of 126,000 men. It seems to us unquestionable that there must be a distance beyond which the invasion of a civilised country by the route of a single line of railway is a physical impossibility. And, whatever that distance may be, we think that it must be appreciably less than that which lies between the shores of the Caspian and the slopes of the Soliman Mountains.

The question of the defence of the frontier of a great empire is one on which it is not safe to nurse illusions. The subject is one to which the attention of the statesman has been long directed, although the information which has been obtained by M. Lessar may tend to modify opinions somewhat too hastily formed.

‘No one,’ said Sir Henry Rawlinson, at the meeting to which we have before referred, ‘will question that the extension of the Russian arms to the east of the Caspian during the last twenty years has been of immense benefit to the country; the substitution, indeed, of Russian rule for that of the Khirgiz, the Uzbeks, and the Turcomans throughout a large portion of Central Asia has been an increased blessing to humanity. But, although this picture is cheerful and reassuring, it does not by any means satisfy me that it is desirable to extend the sphere of Russia’s beneficent action towards India, or that it is our duty, with a view to such a consummation, to assist and encourage M. Lessar’s projected railway to Herat. . . . The mere finding the money for such an undertaking would be a difficulty of the first magnitude. Then, again, complications would certainly arise with the Persian and Afghan Governments, if it were seriously proposed to run a foreign railway through their respective territories; and, finally, the formal opposition of Great Britain would have to be encountered; for whichever party might be in power at the time, I cannot believe that, in the present state of our relations with the East, the nation could ever be brought to look with indifference, still less with complacency, on a measure which, if successful, would destroy our prestige throughout Central Asia, and would further impair that feeling of rest and security within our own frontiers which is essential to the well-being of India, dependent as such well-being notoriously is on the peaceable development of the industries and productive resources of the country.’

It is impossible to read such language without a great deal of respectful sympathy. But the more weight we attach to the motives of the speaker, the more important is it accurately to ascertain the true effect on our defensive position in India of the construction of what we may call a railway caravan route. That a line of 1,266 miles in length, from the shores of the Caspian to the foot of the Bolan Pass, with the intermediate ascent of the Robat Pass to overcome, would form a strategic source of danger, cannot, with our present experience,

be maintained. That an empire which is not military or aggressive in its very nature—an empire the strength of which depends on the peace, justice, and prosperity that enormous populations may enjoy under its beneficent rule—will better maintain its internal order by guarding its natural frontiers, inaccessible, as they may be rendered, to hostile feet, than by displaying an anxiety to surround those frontiers with a fringe of barbarism and desolation, we think it is not unstatesmanlike to hold.

At the meeting of the Royal Geographical Society, November 27, 1882, a letter was received from General Venukoff, the greatest living authority on the geography and ethnology of Central Asia. The General forwarded to the meeting, at which he intended to have been present (but was prevented by illness), a map of the oasis of Tejend, and the roads leading to Merv, which had been drawn up by M. Aminoff, one of the officers of the Russian staff, most fully acquainted with the geography of Central Asia. He also referred to the astronomical determination of the situation of Merv, Ak-robot, and Hauz-i-Khan, by M. Gladyeheff, a distinguished geodetic surveyor.

‘You see then, gentlemen,’ wrote the General, ‘that the Russian pioneers in Central Asia do not fear to follow the example given by their British colleagues, and hasten to meet them. I hope that this meeting will take place, some fine day, in the ramifications of the Hindoo Koosh, when the ancient rivals will shake hands in the name of civilisation and common interests. . . . The policy of the Russian Government, if I understand it, is no menace to your Indian Empire. We have sought, *par tâtonnements*, the natural frontier of the Russian Empire in the Asiatic steppes, and there, for the most part, we have found it; this natural frontier is at the distance of hundreds of miles to the north-west of India.’

It may of course be said that it is not from a Russian general, however distinguished as a geographer, that it is safe to take advice; and there can be no doubt that General Soboleff, the head of the Asiatic Department of the General Russian Staff, of whose hostility to Great Britain there is neither doubt nor disguise, regards the construction of the railway to Herat as a distinct menace to the power of England. It is well to cite and to compare the opinions of able and competent men, whatever be the nature of the motives that may perhaps tend to form them. But the object at which we aim is not to balance opinion, but to collect and compare facts, and to ascertain, as far as possible, what is the real import, political as well as material, of the facts most recently brought

to light. A vast, young, growing, and apparently inexhaustible empire throws its shadow over the breadth of the Old World. When the guides of other States are losing the habit, almost the sense of rule, and the instinct of self-defence, when the populations of other lands are here declining in absolute number, there accompanying an alarming increase in number with a no less alarming decline in physical, intellectual, and moral stature, the youthful and vigorous growth of the Slavonic tribes seems to bid fair for a longer and a stronger future than is at present visible to the peasants of France, or the pallid artisans who are the slaves of the steam-engine. Little wonder that the shifting of that shadow, if only due to the same cause as the shifting of the shadow of the gnomon, may cause alarm in the minds of men with whom patriotism is not a wholly extinct virtue. Here, then, it is of primary importance, first, to group actual facts; secondly, to show what practical science can make of those facts. That being done, the duty of the statesman is done. If there be danger, it must be met at once, firmly, resolutely, unhesitatingly—face to face, and foot to foot. But if, on the contrary, the deduction at which we have arrived from the application to the physical geography of the district between the Tigris and the Indus of the latest outcome of the engineering practice of the present day be unassailable, what a cloud of fear, of grumbling, and of vapouring may not be at once dispelled! What would be the tactical use of a railway of 1,266 miles long ascending a mountain pass by the way, we have endeavoured in all good faith to investigate. And, unless it can be shown that we have incorrectly cited facts, or illogically drawn inferences from them—*cadit questio*—there is an end of the matter; and we may look with unconcern to any extension of the Russian railway from Kizil Arvat.

As an aggressive political movement, we think that the importance of the advance of Russian enterprise in this direction has been enormously exaggerated. If it be in the power of Russia to open new lines of communication to trade through barbarous regions, that is an object which it cannot be the interest or the duty of Great Britain to oppose. Sooner or later these wild countries will be brought within the influence of civilisation; their population will increase, their lands will be cultivated; and their wants, as well as their natural productions, may lead even Central Asia to a closer connexion with the nations of Europe.

- ART. V.—1. *An Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language, to which is prefixed a Dissertation on the Origin of the Scottish Language.* By JOHN JAMIESON, D.D. A new Edition carefully revised and collated, with the entire Supplement incorporated, by JOHN LONGMUIR, A.M., LL.D., and DAVID DONALDSON, F.E.I.S. 4 vols. Paisley: 1879–1882.
2. *A Critical Inquiry into the Scottish Language, with the View of Illustrating the Rise and Progress of Civilisation in Scotland.* By FRANCISQUE-MICHEL. Edinburgh and London: 1882.
3. *The Poetry and Humour of the Scottish Language.* By CHARLES MACKAY, LL.D. Paisley: 1882.

THE works which we have placed at the head of this article indicate that the Scottish language is attracting a considerable amount of attention at the present time. This is what might have been expected. The language is rapidly disappearing, the area in which it is spoken becomes narrower every day, and soon all living traces of it will have vanished. It is desirable, before this end arrives, that a complete collection of its phenomena should be made. Such a collection will be of the greatest value to the historian, the antiquary, and the philologist; for the language is rich in words and phrases characteristic of the religious, social, and political habits and features of the people, it contains a mine of superstitions and survivals, and it abounds in illustrations of the laws of language. But whether spoken or not, the vernacular language of Scotland can never perish, because, unlike the provincial dialects of South Britain, it has a splendid literature. It has been for ages the language of poetry, of history, and of law; and it has culminated in recent times in the poems of Burns and the tales of Walter Scott.

It is scarcely necessary to remark that what is now called the Scotch language is a dialectical form of English, and was and is spoken only by the Teutonic portion of the Scotch people. In earliest times the term was applied to Gaelic, the language spoken by the Celtic portion of the Scottish people, but this use of the appellation has ceased. The Lowland Scotch and Gaelic are quite different languages. Gaelic is unintelligible to the Lowland Scot, and Scotch is unintelligible to the Celt. Gaelic, like Scotch, is destined soon to disappear from Scotland. School Boards and Government grants are powerful destructives. Ardent Celts are eager to employ artificial means

to stem the progress of decay, but the ultimate issue is certain, and they act more wisely who take every opportunity to gather up the fragments of the language and literature that remain and preserve them for future generations.

To Dr. Richard Morris is mainly due the credit of pointing out the place which Scotch holds among the dialects of English. He showed that there were, speaking broadly, three great dialects of English, which he named the Southern, the Midland, and the Northern. The Northern prevailed from the mouth of the Humber northwards, and was spoken alike by the natives of Yorkshire and Aberdeenshire. The Midland was the dialect used by Chaucer, whose influence made it the literary language of England for all time to come. The Northern was the literary language of Scotland till the time of James I. of England. English then became the vehicle of Scottish literary men when they did not employ Latin, and the old Northern dialect, modified by time and circumstances, remained in use among the masses of the people, and indeed was spoken by the cultivated classes till the beginning of the present century. It was this dialect that came home to the Scottish heart, and accordingly ballads, songs, and other popular works were written in it, and in this way arose a Scotch popular literature quite distinct from English, and to some extent unintelligible to English-speaking people.

There are thus two marked periods of Scottish literature, the earlier embracing the time when the Scotch writers employed the dialect called Northern in contrast with the Midland or Southern, the second when Scotch became the dialect of conversation and of popular and distinctively national productions. In the first case Scotch is a literary language. Many of the Scotch writers were men of great cultivation. They were well acquainted with French and Latin, and they have adorned their style by graces borrowed from the romances, histories, and poems which they were in the habit of reading. In the second case the language is liable to all the fluctuations that mark a purely spoken tongue. It is subject to no laws of traditional models, its spelling and its grammar are allowed considerable liberties, and it follows the bent of its own genius.

Furious controversies have raged around the origin of this Scottish language, and considerable diversities of opinion still exist. Jamieson's Dictionary is prefaced by a dissertation on the origin of the Scottish language in which the author maintains, with fierce partisanship, that the Picts were Teutons; and he has had many adherents. Others were and are equally certain that they were Celts. But it may be doubted whether

that question has anything to do with the solution of the problem presented by the Scottish language. More accurate results are to be expected from a careful analysis of the language. This is a work that has yet to be done. The books at the head of this article are valuable contributions to it. Jamieson's Dictionary is a work of profound learning and research. The author availed himself of all the resources which were then at his command, and he made himself especially familiar with the Scandinavian group of languages and with Northern literature. The work received a hearty welcome from this Journal when it appeared in 1808. Seventeen years after this Jamieson published a supplement characterised by the same unwearied diligence and wide range of reading and enquiry. It was then suggested in this Journal that the supplement should have been embodied in the dictionary and the whole work recast. The present editors have acted on the suggestion in part. They have incorporated the supplement with the dictionary, and they have made additions borrowed principally from Mr. Gregor's 'Dialect of Banffshire' and Mr. Edmonston's 'Etymological Glossary of the Shetland and Orkney Dialect' without acknowledgment and on no definite principle. But no attempt has been made to recast the book. And yet this is absolutely requisite if the book is to meet the demands of the age. Jamieson does not pretend to give the pronunciation of the words. This unquestionably ought to be done. Some uniform system of spelling should be adopted, and the words arranged according to this system, and all the various spellings should be mentioned under the one word. Jamieson consulted every available source in order to settle the etymology of the words, and his work is suggestive in the highest degree. But the science of language has made great strides since his time, and a band of diligent scholars have devoted their attention to all the forms of Teutonic and especially to the Norse languages. To take one instance, the researches of Sir George Dasent, Mr. Cleasby, and Mr. Vigfusson have thrown a flood of light on the Icelandic language and literature, and the Icelandic dictionary, in the preparation of which these three scholars took a part, is invaluable to the student of Scotch. Then the historical method has to be applied to a Scotch dictionary. The word should be traced through the various authors that use it. There is great variety of dialectic differences even in Scotch, and sometimes these dialectic differences exist in districts contiguous to each other. Words and phrases are current in one district which are unintelligible in others. The lexicographer has thus to investigate the locale

of the words or of their pronunciation. And then it would be very advisable that he should draw out, as Mr. Skeat has done in his admirable etymological dictionary, a list of the various words occurring in the language according to the sources from which they have been derived. Even more than this has to be done by the editor who would do justice to Jamieson's idea. His dictionary does not merely discuss words, but enquires into games, superstitions, festivals, and other features of national life, and in this way the editor has to act the part of historian and antiquary. Much has been done in this direction since Jamieson's day, but it lies scattered in fugitive periodicals and rare books, and much still remains to be done. Probably no single individual could accomplish this task satisfactorily, and it is much to be wished that a company of scholars should undertake the task and divide the labour among them.

M. Francisque-Michel is already well known by his book on the historical connexion between France and Scotland. The present volume will add to his reputation. The intention of the work is not very clearly stated in the title. It is an enquiry into all the words that Scotch has derived from French, and thereby he endeavours to show to what extent Scotland is indebted to France in the matter of civilisation. He has added two appendices in which he gives a list of words 'which, in all probability, came to Scotland directly from the 'Norse languages,' and a list of 'words derived from the 'Celtic.' These lists are far from complete, but M. Michel deserves credit for having made the attempt. Even in the French part, the reader feels that M. Michel is animated by a strong French bias, and that a wider range of reading and a wider knowledge of philology are requisite to reach such etymologies as would command the confidence of scholars. At the same time his diligence is worthy of all praise.

Dr. Charles Mackay's book is a bright genial production, full of learning and studded with apt quotations. The writer, as might be expected, has a tendency to see Gaelic roots where they have never been seen before; but many of his suggestions are well worth consideration, and are interesting even when they are not correct.

The basis of the Scotch language is unquestionably Teutonic. No one has doubted or can doubt this. But we cannot advance much further without entering on debateable ground. Was the Teutonic element Saxon or Scandinavian? How far has it been influenced by Gaelic? Was the Teutonic basis forced upon a Celtic population? Or was the people originally Teutonic? These and such like questions crop up on every

hand. It would be presumptuous to attempt a settlement of these questions in an article, but it may not be uninteresting to look at some of the philological aspects of the Scotch language.

It is agreed on all hands that Scotch contains elements derived from a great variety of sources. Danes and Norsemen often landed on the shores of Scotland, and held sway for a time over a large portion of the coast and the islands. The Scotch had frequent commercial transactions with Holland, and were soldiers of fortune in nearly every country in Europe. They had for centuries a league with France, and continual intercourse took place between the two countries. And they had for neighbours, living in the same land, nominally if not really under the same sway, a large Celtic population who intermarried with them, and finally became one nation with them. We shall glance at these influences.

The slightest of all these is unquestionably the Dutch or Flemish. But still there are many traces of this connexion. '*Fleming-lanche*' is a 'term used,' says Jamieson, 'to denote the indulgence granted to the Flemings, who anciently settled in Scotland, to retain some of their national usages.' And he quotes from the '*Caledonia*' of Chalmers the following passage:—'The Flemings, who colonised Scotland during the twelfth century, settled chiefly on the east coast, in such numbers as to be found useful; and they behaved so quietly as to be allowed the practice of their own usages, by the name of '*Fleming-lanche*, in the nature of a special custom.' It was with a word derived from Flemish traffic that James VI., according to the story, tried to puzzle his stable-boy. 'Callan,' he said, 'hae, there's threttie pennies; gae wa and buy me a jockteleg.' A *jockteleg* is a folding-knife, deriving its name from *Jacques de Liège*, a town which, according to Grose, formerly supplied Scotland with cutlery.

The influence of France on the Scottish language was great, deep, and lasting. It has to be remembered that Scotland derived its principal lessons in civilisation from France, that its universities were modelled on that of Paris, that its legal system and apparatus were borrowed from France, that French was the language of the Scottish court for a considerable period, and that it was taught at some of the universities. There is a curious circumstance in connexion with this French influence. At the period of the War of Independence, Scotland was in close league with France, but the War of Independence was a struggle of the Teutonic portion of the people against the Normans. Accordingly the Scottish writers of this age re-

jected with scorn the introduction of Norman-French words into the language, and Barbour and Wynthoun write purer English than Chaucer. Indeed many portions of these writers, if the spelling were altered, would be easily intelligible to the reader of the present day, partly because these Norman-French words are absent, and partly because the Northern and Scottish dialect sooner rejected those grammatical inflections which are now universally rejected than either the Midland or Southern dialect. Thus, turning up Wynthoun, we light on this passage:—

‘ A thousand three hunder and the fift year
 Efter (after) the birth of our Lord dear,
 Sir John of Menteth in tha (those) days
 Took in Glasgow William Walays (Wallace),
 And send him in till England soon.
 There was he quartered and undone
 Be (by) despite and hat (hot) envy;
 There he tholed this martyry.’

Here we have altered the spelling only when there was no real difference. The one word unknown to modern English is *tholed*, which is still in regular use in Scotch. It is an Aryan word, and is cognate with Greek $\tauλα$ and the Latin *tul* in *tuli*, and like these words signifies ‘to endure.’ Scotch has a considerable number of these Aryan words which have vanished from English.

When the antagonisms of the War of Independence had calmed down, there was less repugnance to adopt French words, and accordingly the writings of Dunbar and Douglas and their contemporaries abound in them. Many of the words thus adopted never became part of the common speech, and fell into desuetude. The work of Michel supplies us with innumerable instances, as—*adwertance*, ‘retinue;’ *ambassate*, ‘an embassy;’ *amplacioun*, ‘enlargement;’ *antecessour*, ‘ancestor;’ *begarye*, ‘to stripe;’ *clientelle*, ‘dependants;’ *chirurgieane*, ‘surgeon;’ *chevisance*, ‘means of acquiring;’ *dereglas*, ‘loose habits;’ *dyschowyll*, ‘undressed;’ *exhause*, ‘elevate;’ *eschaip*, ‘escape;’ *prochainie*, ‘neighbouring;’ *seiele*, ‘age;’ *suppriss*, ‘oppression.’ But it is astonishing how many French words found their way into ordinary talk and are still current in the homes of Scotland. Thus to *fash*, ‘to trouble’ (*fâcher*), with the adjective *fashious*, and the noun *fashiousness*, are understood by everyone, and come at once to the mind as the most natural expression of the idea. So the verb to *tash* (*tacher*), ‘to spot, to defile,’ is of frequent occurrence. Besides these there are verbs, such as *frap*, ‘to strike down, destroy;’

devall, 'to cease;' *stravaig* (*extravaguer*), 'to stroll;' *trock*, 'to barter,' which are current in certain districts among the common people. It is a sign that a deep impression has been made when verbs thus pass from one language to another. Of nouns that are still in ordinary use the number is great, and they penetrate into every part of humble life. The housewife gets from the French her *ashet* (*assiette*), her *haggis*, her *hotch-potch*, her *dresser*, her *awmry*, her *bucket*, and her *bonnet*. The gardener speaks of his *geans*, his *grosets*, and his *rizzards*; and he was wont to water his plants with a *rooser* (Fr. *arroser*). The workman is clothed in *fustian* and *corduroy*, and puts on his *camlet* cloak and his *mittens*. The boy has his *paumie*, his *bonles* (marbles), and his *dragons* (kites). And the names of manufactories still wear a French aspect, for the Scotch still speak of a *tannerée*, a *roperée*, a *soaperée*. Even the idiom of the language was affected, for it was common to call twelve o'clock *twal* hours, and four o'clock *four* hours, and to designate by these terms the meals which were then taken. If we were to ascend in the scale of life, we should find the same prevalence of French. The student gets his bursary from French, the town its provost and bailies, and the Court of Session its advocates and numerous law terms. But these matters are fully discussed by M. Michel, and we need say no more of them.

It is rather the tendency of modern scholars to magnify the Celtic element, but no clear proofs have been adduced that it made a serious impression on the Scotch language. In this matter scholars are apt to forget that when two different languages are spoken in contiguous districts, they are sure to borrow from each other. The question, therefore, always remains for settlement, 'Did the Gaelic borrow the word from the Scotch, or the Scotch from the Gaelic?' No instance has been produced in which Gaelic influenced the grammar of Scotch. It is conceded that its action is confined to pronunciation and the lending of words. But even in the case of pronunciation no clear example can be adduced. The modern Highlander uses *t* for *d*, *p* for *b*, *f* for *v*, *k* for hard *g*, and *sh* for soft *g*, as 'He is a'fery (very) kreat (great) and paad (bad). 'shentleman (gentleman), that I have seen this tay (day).' But there are no traces of this peculiarity in Scotch. Dr. Murray, whose work on the dialect of the Southern counties of Scotland is the best contribution that has been made in these days to Scotch philology, supposes that the North Country Gaelic contact is proved by *f* for *wh*, as in *fa*, *fat*, for 'wha' (who) and 'what,' but nothing is more unlikely. The inhabitants.

of the northern coast are strongly Scandinavian in build, character, and traditions, and their intercourse with the Celts must have been comparatively slight and far from cordial. It is more probable that the peculiarity has arisen indigenously from the practical turn of the people, since it is much easier to say *fa* than *wha*. When we examine the words derived from Gaelic, our impression is strongly confirmed. Not a single verb of undoubted Gaelic extraction has found its way, so far as we have observed, into the current popular speech. Many of the borrowed Gaelic words are of rare occurrence, and would be unintelligible to most Scotsmen. There thus remain only a comparatively few that have been really incorporated in the language, such as *brogue*, 'a rough kind of shoe,' *clachan*, 'a village,' *cairn*, 'a heap of stones,' *cuttie*, 'a short pipe,' &c., *galach*, 'a beetle,' and *quaich*, 'a cup.' The etymology of *brae*, 'hill,' *byre*, 'cowhouse,' *cogue*, 'a vessel,' *kebbuch*, 'a cheese,' *gowan*, 'daisy,' *ingle*, 'fireside,' and *skep*, 'beehive,' is matter of dispute. Even some of the words which are associated with the Celtic population are of foreign origin. The original of *pibroch* is, in all probability, the Norse *pipa* with a Celtic termination, *kilt* is unquestionably Scandinavian, and *tartan* is French. Jamieson has a long learned note on this last word, showing that it comes from *tiretaine*, signifying 'linsey-woolsey, or a kind of it worn by the peasants in France.' Subsequent investigations have confirmed Jamieson's derivation. Michel quotes a passage to the effect that in 1505 a quhissilar (money-changer) 'had French tartane to be anc 'cote.' Perhaps there is no element of the language which requires more minute historical investigation than the Gaelic, and it will probably be found that many of the Gaelic words now current among Scotch-speaking people are of recent introduction. Large numbers of the Highlanders in the last century and beginning of this were evicted or left their hills to seek occupation at manufactories in the towns along the east coast, and mingled in this way with the Lowland population. These have made many Celtic words familiar to the Lowland Scot, and some of them have passed into the daily language.

The Teutonic groundwork of the language also presents a problem to the philologist. From what portion of the Teutonic race was the Scotch language derived? Some hold that it was a branch of these same Angles who colonised the middle and south of England, and that they pushed their way northwards from Yorkshire; others hold that it was Scandinavians, Danes or Norwegians, who effected settlements on the east coast of Scotland. This problem it is not easy to solve. A

difficulty presents itself at the outset—the difficulty of discovering criteria by which a judgment might be reached. The Anglian language, and the Scandinavian or Norse, are Teutonic, and are, therefore, radically the same. They must have had many grammatical forms and very many words in common. What was the difference between them? And how, in tracing a language, are we to be sure that we can definitely assign the forms to one and not to the other? The matter is still more complicated by the facts of the case. Only a few fragments remain of the Anglian language out of which the English Northern dialect developed. Dr. Murray, who is strongly in favour of the theory that the Anglian is the immediate progenitor of Scotch, states his case thus. He says that

‘he sees reason to believe that the Northern dialect from the beginning diverged from the classical Anglo-Saxon in a direction which made it more closely connected in form with the Scandinavian. The chief points in which the language of the Ruthwell Cross and the verses of *Cædmon* and *Beda* differ from the contemporary West Saxon, are the inflectional characteristics which distinguish the Scandinavian and Frisian from the Saxon and German division of the Teutonic languages. There seems ground, therefore, to regard many of the characteristics of the Northern dialect which currently pass as Danish as having been original elements of the North Angle speech, due to the fact that this dialect was, like the Frisian, one which formed a connecting link between the Scandinavian and Germanic branches. Such characteristics would of course be strengthened and increased by the influx of Danish and Norwegian settlers, but the influence of these was necessarily at first confined to particular localities, and only gradually and at a later period affected the Northern dialect as a whole.’

This is, of course, mere supposition, but it adds to the intricacies of the problem to be solved. Purely Scandinavian elements appear in the Scotch language. Are we to believe that these came with the very groundwork of the language, and indicate a Scandinavian origin? Or are we to suppose that they formed part of the North-Anglian dialect? Or are we to suppose that they were subsequently introduced into the English Northern dialect or Scotch by Danish or Norwegian settlers? This is a tangled skein which may well baffle philology to unravel. Recourse has been had to history, but the historical notices are too general and defective to be of any avail. It is not credible, as some have supposed, that Danes and Norwegians did not visit the east coast of Scotland till the eighth century. Their boats must have drifted to the Scottish coast before any historical record exists, and Norsemen would, no doubt, go to Scotland in search of their shipwrecked relatives

and fellow-countrymen. Then, as far as Roman historians are concerned, Danes, Norsemen, Saxons, would all be described by the one name of Germans, and, as the whole northern region was practically unknown, one tribe would be confounded with another. For these and many such reasons history can furnish us with no satisfactory explanation of the language.

A minute enquiry into the component parts of the language might be more helpful, but such an enquiry must be thorough and impartial if it is to be convincing. It would not be possible in our space to do justice to such a theme, but we may draw attention to the problem by noticing some of the most striking features of the Scottish language. And we shall confine ourselves to a large extent to the popular dialect. This dialect has also gone through various stages, and it exists in what we may call various degrees of mixture. At first it had almost no contact with the literary language of England, but gradually English has blended with Scotch, until Scotch has often become merely English sprinkled with a few Scotch words. Scotch can thus be presented to the reader in all stages of intelligibility or the opposite. A few examples will suffice. The first specimen we take is from 'Ajax's Speech to the Grecian Knabbs in broad Buchans from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, lib. xiii.'—

' Yet routh o' honour he has got
 Ev'n tho' he gets the glaik,
 Fan he's sae crous that he wou'd try
 To be brave Ajax' maik.'

Routh, *glaik*, *fan*, *sae*, *crous*, and *maik* are distinctively Scotch. *Routh* means 'plenty,' *get the glaik* is 'to be deceived,' *fan* is for 'when,' *sae* is for 'so,' *crous* is 'bold,' generally with the idea of swagger, and *maik* is the Scotch form of 'match.'

Our next example is from a prose journal from London to Portsmouth in the same dialect:—

' By this time, it wis time to mak the meel-an-bree an' deel about the castacks, bat deil a word o' that cou'd I hear i this house; well, thinks I, an' this be the gate o't I'll better gang to my bed as I'm boden: fan they saw that, they sent in some smachry or ither to me an' a pint of their scuds, as sour as ony bladoch or wigg that comes out o' the reem kirn.'

This passage exhibits some peculiarities of Scotch grammar. It may be literally translated thus:—

' By this time it was time to make the brose (dish of oatmeal mixed with broth or water) and divide the cabbages, but not a word of that

could I hear in this house; well, I think, if this be the way of it, I will better go to my bed as I am bidden. When they saw that, they sent in some trash or other to me and a pint of their ale as sour as any buttermilk or whey that comes out of the cream-churn.'

In both these extracts the writer has deliberately selected peculiar Scottish words. He writes with the consciousness of English in his mind. The same may be said of a considerable number of Scotch poems written by men who were in the habit of using English. A very good specimen of this kind of production is the poet Beattie's letter to Mr. Alexander Ross, author of the 'Fortunate Shepherdess.' One stanza brings out well the suitability of Scotch for description:—

' Oh ! bonny are our greensward hows,
Where through the birks the birny rows,
And the bee bums, and the ox lows,
And saft winds rusle,
And shepherd lads on sunny knows
Blaw the blythe fusle.'

Bonny is beautiful, *hows* and *knows* are for hollows and knolls, the *birny* is diminutive of burn or streamlet, *birks* is for birches, *saft* and *blaw* for soft and blow, and *blythe fusle* is the merry or lively pipe (Scotch whistle). Numerous instances of the last stage of Scotch are to be met with in Burns. The words are nearly all English, but they take the Scotch form; the *o*'s become *a*, the *l* vanishes, *gold* becoming *gowd*; the final *d* is omitted, as *lan'* for *land*, and Scotch liberties with grammar are taken. Take the lines—

' Then let us pray that come it may,
As come it will for a' that;
That sense and worth o'er a' the earth
May bear the gree and a' that.
For a' that and a' that,
It's coming yet, for a' that,
That man to man, the world o'er
Shall brothers be for a' that.'

Here the only Scottish word is *gree*; *bear the gree* is to carry off the victory. Other words are modified after a Scotch fashion. *All* is made *a'*, *over* is made *o'er*, *world* is made *warld*, but there is no attempt at consistency, for *brothers* is inserted instead of *brithers*.

The real kern or nucleus of a language is seen in the nouns denoting familiar things and the verbs denoting familiar actions. In this light it may be worth while to take a glance at the Scotch terms that designate the parts of the body. And here we have a phenomenon which presents itself in the Ho-

meric and probably in most unsettled languages. In Homer there are two words for head, *κάρα* and *κεφαλή*, two for eyes, *ὄσσε* and *ὀφθαλμοί*, two for heart, *κραδίη* and *ἦτορ*, and so with several other parts of the body. But in the course of time one of these two synonyms disappeared, and the other became the accepted word of the language. The same is the case with Scotch as compared with English. Scotch has several words for the same part. Sometimes one or more of the words have a comical effect. But nearly every word is Teutonic in its origin, and some of them are distinctly Scandinavian. The word for head is the English word 'head' pronounced *heed*. The earlier form *heved* or *hewid* occurs in Barbour, and a compound of it *haffit*, 'half head,' 'the side of the head' or 'the part of the face between the cheek and the ear downward to the turn of the jaw,' is current in Scotch. *Forrat* is the Scotch contraction of forehead. *Pow* and *pash* are also used for the head. *Pow* is another form of *poll*, which in slightly varying forms occurs in old Dutch, Swedish, Danish, and Low German. *Pash* is a comical word. Its derivation is unknown. The word for 'brains' is *harns*, and the skull is called *harnpan*. This is recognised by philologists as Aryan and cognate with *κάρα*, *κρανίον*, the *cere-* of *cerebrum*, *hwair* of the Gothic *hwairnei*, and the *hir* of the German *Gehirn*. *Brein*, on the other hand, is found in Anglo-Saxon and Dutch. The *brain* in Scotch signifies voice. The eye is *ee* with plural *een*. Probably an earlier form of the word appears in *winnock* or *windock*, 'a window,' which comes close to the Icelandic *windauge*, i.e. windeye. The eyebrow is *bree*, the pupil of the eye the *stern o' the ee*, and the eyelashes are somewhat ludicrously called *winkers*. The eyes are also called *heekers* and *peepers* with a comical effect. The word for the nose is *niz*, spelled also *neis*, *nes*, and *nease*. It is the same word as the Latin *nasus*, the English *nose*, and the Icelandic *nes* or *ness* of geographical meaning. For the mouth there are several terms. First there is *mon*, a contraction of the English mouth, but a remnant of an earlier form exists in a phrase used by boys, 'I'll gie you i' the munds,' that is, 'I will give you a stroke on 'the mouth.' *Mund* is the form still prevalent in Germany. Another word for mouth is *gab*. Jamieson quotes 'Ye tak 'mair in your gab than your cheeks can had' (hold). *Gob* is another form of it. It is often heard in the phrase 'the gift of 'the gab,' that is, 'facility in talking.' It may possibly be connected with Icelandic *gabba*, 'mockery.' Jamieson connects with this word *gaberosie*, 'a kiss,' but suggests also another derivation: 'Cambro-Britannic or Welsh *gobyr* signifies a

‘ recompense, wages, hire, and *osi*, “ to attempt ; ” perhaps “ to attempt or offer to give a recompense.”’ *Chafsts*, ‘ the jaws,’ corrupted in English into *chops* or *chaps*, is purely Scandinavian. *Gam* is a tooth, *gans* the jaws without teeth, *gash* the projection of the under jaw, and *geggers* the under lip—all words of doubtful origin. *Flytepoek* (literally scolding bag) and *choler*, *chuller*, or *churl* signify double chin. *Lug* is the word for ear. It is not unknown to early English writers. Its derivation is uncertain.

Lufe and *macgs* are both used for ‘ hand ’ as well as *han*’ itself. *Lufe* is the palm of the hand. Its original is found in Mæso-Gothic and in Celtic, but not in Anglo-Saxon. *Macgs* is a Shetland word applied to the flippers of the seal, and is unknown to the current Scotch. *Neine* or *neif*, ‘ the fist,’ is in common use. Jamieson asserts that cognate words occur in Icelandic and Danish, but that no cognate appears in Anglo-Saxon or in any of the dialects of Gothic. Skeat also calls the word Scandinavian. It is found in Shakespeare. *Elbock* or *elbuck* is Scotch for ‘ elbow,’ the *ck* representing the *g* of the Anglo-Saxon *elboga*, which is retained by the German *elbogen*. *Gardy* is used for the arm, *gardy-bane* the bone of the arm, and *gardy-chair* an elbow-chair. *Oxter* or *ouster* is the armpit, connected with the German *achsel*. *Crag*, *crage*, or *craig*, is the neck, and also the throat. It has numerous cognates in the Teutonic languages. *Forecraig* is the anterior part of the throat. *Thrupple*, ‘ the windpipe,’ is derived from the Scandinavian form of the Anglo-Saxon word which gives ‘ throat ’ and ‘ throttle ’ in English. The Icelandic word is *strjúpi*, the Danish *strube*, and the Swedish *strupe*. The simple word occurs in Scotch in the form of *stroup* or *stroop*, the throat or spout of a kettle or such vessel. The word *hass* or *hals*, still current in Germany, is also used in Scotch for the throat. Various words are used for the stomach, as *kyte*, *groof*, *wame*, *hib*. *Kyte* and *groof* are Scandinavian, and Icelandic, like Scotch, uses *vömb* for the belly as well as for the womb. ‘ Bib ’ Jamieson supposes to be a transference from the clothing to the part clothed. *Shanks* (Teut.) is the ordinary word for the legs. *Shaum* and *shockles* are also used for them. *Shaum* may possibly be connected with *jambe*, as Jamieson suggests. *Shockles* is a comical word derived from *shockle* or *shachle*, ‘ to walk in a shuffling manner,’ just as *shanks* is connected with *shake*. *Hurdies* are the hips or buttocks, and *spash* is foot. The word *hunkers* Jamieson traces to Icelandic. ‘ To sit on one’s hunkers ’ is ‘ to sit with the hips hanging downwards and the weight of the body depending on the knees,’ and the verb ‘ to hunker down ’ is defined ‘ to

squat down.' *Cute, coot, cuitt*, pronounced *queet* in Aberdeenshire, is the ankle. Jamieson derives it from Teutonic *kote, talus*. Michel is a little far-fetched in associating it with *cou-de-pied*. There are other words that signify parts of the body, for we do not profess to exhaust the subject. But of those quoted all except *gardy* are Teutonic or of unknown derivation, and some of the most important are Scandinavian.

The Scotch, notwithstanding the admixtures received from Celtic and French, is much more Teutonic than modern English. The reason is that there is very little of that Latin element which was introduced into English by Elizabethan and later literary men. In Scotch the old Teutonic words have retained their place, and thus it happens that one may hear from a Scotch peasant many words which occur in Chaucer and Shakespeare but are now obsolete in English, and also many words which are still current in modern German. Thus *frem* or *fremd*, 'strange,' *snell*, 'sharp,' *gilt*, 'money,' *doss*, 'a box,' *nam*, 'to take,' *shed*, 'to divide,' *knab*, 'a lad,' *wale*, 'to choose,' *swack*, 'supple,' *sweir*, 'lazy,' and *gin*, 'by' (referring to time), are good Scotch words, and have their representatives in the modern German words *fremd, schnell, geld, dose, nehmen, scheiden, knabe, wählen, schwach, schwer*, and *gegen*. The meanings are in some cases slightly different, as *swack* is 'supple,' and *schwach* is 'weak,' *sweir* is 'lazy and unwilling,' *schwer* is 'heavy, difficult;' but the meanings are always closely connected. In Scotch occur some Scandinavian words which probably did not find their way into English, as *tine*, to lose, *gar*, to compel, *toom*, empty. Some of the non-English words are very expressive, and indeed so necessary that they are now being adopted. This is the case with the word *scamp*, 'to do work in a negligent manner,' derived from Norse. 'To slim' has the same meaning in Scotch, and has also found its way into modern English. *Sough*, 'a low noise,' *glumour* (Scand.), *glint* (Scand.), *gloamin'*, and other words connected with light, have obtained entrance here and there. There are many other words, mostly derived from Scandinavian, which it is difficult to express in English in any other way than by words derived from Latin, such as *stot*, 'to rebound,' *hain*, 'to spare,' *lowe*, 'a flame,' *grne*, 'to feel horror,' *mask*, 'to infuse,' *speir*, 'to enquire for.' Sometimes the Scotch has a whole family of words where the English has retained only a stray member. Thus *ugly* is the only certain remnant of such a family. In Scotch we have the verb *ug*, sometimes spelled *oug*, 'to feel abhorrence.' Jamieson quotes an instance from Ramsay's poems:—

‘ The rattling drum and trumpet’s tout
 Delight young swankies that are stout;
 What his kind frightened mother *ugs*
 Is music to the soger’s lugs.’

Then there are *ugsum*, *ugsome*, *ougsum*, and *ugfow*, ‘frightful, terrible, causing one to shudder with horror,’ and *ugsumnes*, ‘horror.’ Mr. Gregor adds to the words in Jamieson the noun *ug*, signifying both ‘disgust’ and ‘a person of disagreeable, disgusting manners,’ *ug*, ‘to become disgusted,’ and *uggan*, ‘the act of being disgusted.’ Similarly in English, *uncouth* is a remnant of a large stock of words. It is the past participle of the verb to *ken*, with the negative particle *un*, and properly signifies ‘unknown.’ In Scotch the participle *couth*, ‘known,’ is found. *Uncouth* itself takes the form of *unco*, and while it is employed occasionally to mean ‘unknown,’ it generally signifies ‘strange.’ Then we have *couthie*, *uncouthy*, *uncouthness*, *canny*, *uncanny*, and other words of a like nature. To take one other instance, we have in Scotch the verb from which ‘fond’ comes. *To fon* is ‘to play the fool,’ and is Scandinavian.

Perhaps there is no point in which English has deviated from its Teutonic ancestors more than in the refusal to make native compounds. Where German combines its own Teutonic words, English introduces all kinds of amalgamations from Latin, Greek, and Teutonic, and so a host of words arises, such as telegraph, photography, cable-gram, planisphere, architrave. Scotch retained this power of combining its own words, such as *backspeirer*, ‘cross-interrogator,’ *furthsetter*, ‘publisher,’ *up-tak*, ‘understanding, apprehension,’ *forespeaker*, ‘advocate,’ *about-speech*, ‘circumlocution,’ *gain-cum*, ‘coming again, return,’ *gane-calling*, ‘revocation,’ *gang-days*, ‘days of perambulation or of walking through the bounds of a parish in Rogation-week,’ *guide-the-fire*, ‘a poker,’ *gaun-a-du*, ‘going to do,’ *care-bed-lair*, ‘a disconsolate position.’ *Bairn’s bairn* is ‘grandchild,’ *dochter-dochter* is ‘grand-daughter,’ and *forebears* is ‘ancestors.’ So in Scotch there is not merely *forenoon*, but *foreday*, *forenicht*, *foresupper*, and *after-supper*. A very large number of words are formed by combination of nouns or verbs with *for* and *fore*, *up*, *through*, *gain*, *hame*, *down*, *out*, *aff*, *re*, *di*, and such like. Some of these words bear a striking analogy to German. Thus *for* often represents the German *ver*, as *for-staw*, ‘to understand,’ in German *verstehen*. Adjectives and nouns also combine with each other. To take one instance, the adjective *gud* (good) unites with nouns in a variety of meanings. Thus *gud-man* is ‘head of the house, husband,’ *gudwife*, ‘wife of the master of the house,’ *gudsyr*, ‘a grandfather,’ *gud-*

dame, 'a grandmother.' *Gud-father*, *gud-mother*, *gud-son*, and *gud-dochter*, may be either 'father-in-law' or 'step-father,' 'mother-in-law' or 'step-mother,' 'son-in-law' or 'step-son,' 'daughter-in-law' or 'step-daughter,' *gud-brother* and *gud-sister*, 'brother-in-law' and 'sister-in-law;' *gud-anes* are 'Sunday clothes,' *gude-folk* are 'the fairies,' *gude-will* is a 'gratuity,' *gud-willie*, 'munificent,' *guid-ways*, 'in a good way,' *good-willer*, 'one who wishes well to another.' The Scotch peasant still retains his attachment to Tenthonic words. A lucifer match is a *spunk*, spectacles are *glasses* or *breels*, seissors are *shears*, and liquorice is *black sugar*.

The philological aspects of the Scotch language derive peculiar interest from the relation that exists between Scotch literature and the spoken language. The spoken language dominates the literature. The literature is subject to no special laws, and does not react on the spoken language. It reproduces exactly the spoken speech. Scotch has thus full freedom to go its own way, and as it goes its own way, its track is faithfully imprinted in the literary products. In this way there exist side by side the unrestrained movement of the language and a permanent record of that movement.

Before treating of the philology of Scotch it may be necessary to remove a false idea which generally prevails in regard to language, and which has been much fostered by recent text-books. Frequent mention is made of the growth and decay of language, but the terms are as inappropriate to language as they are to a rock. Additions and entailments may take place, and these may take place slowly. Letters and syllables may be added or be taken away, but they do not send forth buds which burst into blossoms, nor do they rot and then drop off. The only reason for applying to them the words *growth* and *decay* is that living intelligence or living instinct is the power that adds or takes away, but this is not a sufficient reason. Successive geologists may strike off portions of a rock, but we do not say on that account that the rock decays. We may indeed use the terms metaphorically. We can say that a building grows under the skill of an architect, but the growth is purely metaphorical. It is important to draw attention to this fact, for many of the speculations on the development of language are based on this false analogy. Indeed, if there were a growth in language, it would be something like that of the Hyperborean people mentioned by Ælian, who, at their birth, attained their greatest height, and in the progress of life gradually became smaller, until they quietly disappeared altogether from off the face of the land.

It is also necessary to say a word in regard to the principle which some have supposed to regulate the changes in language. That principle has been expressed by the term *laziness*. But there is no real foundation for such an assertion, and it arises mainly from neglecting to notice that there are two distinct processes in language, the creative and the reproductive. In the first case the human being tries to discover some mode of utterance by which he may make his wants or ideas known to his fellow-men. After he has created the word and it has become the recognised symbol of the idea, it is henceforth the tool of the reproducer or employer of words, whose only object in dealing with it is to make it as short as is consistent with intelligibility. An example will make this matter clear. It was natural for the inventor of a child's carriage to call it a *perambulator*. The name described the object of the contrivance. But when it became permanently affixed to the particular thing, the employer of the word no longer thought of its derivative meaning, but of the thing itself. To him the word was unnecessarily and inconveniently long, and he could convert it into *pram*, without loss of clearness. In the same way *preliminary examination* is an appropriate expression for the transaction which it designates, but the student does not require so many syllables to convey the idea to his own or another's mind, and he is content with *prelim.*, and if he has to speak of examination at all, it is an *exam.* or a *xam*. It is not sheer laziness that leads to this curtailment. It is that the longer form, natural to the inventor, is totally unnecessary for the employer of the word, and so the shorter word passes into general use. The process is not necessarily one of abridgment, though it generally is. If the idea happens to be expressed by the inventor intelligibly but not forcibly enough, the word may be accepted, but the employers of it may alter it so as to make sense and sound correspond to each other. Thus the English word 'thunder' has no *d* in its root. The Scotch word is *thunner*, the German is *donner*, and the root is *tan*, to stretch. The English ear required an intensification of this sound to suit the idea, and accordingly *d* was inserted. In the same way the Scotch word for 'sound' is *soun*, like Latin *sonus*. The English inserted a *d*.

There are probably traces in the Scotch language of a faculty which is now almost gone from us—the faculty of creating language. This faculty has sometimes been resolved into what is styled the onomatopoeic—that is, a direct imitation of the sounds of nature to indicate the objects from which these sounds issue or with which they are associated in the

mind. But more than this is meant by the creative faculty. Just as the tones of music can embody the emotions of the soul, so all sounds can be brought into play to express the ideas of the human mind, and they do so by what we may term a congeniality with the mind. This congeniality cannot be defined, but where the creative power of language exists the idea evokes a sound congenial to it, and language is produced. There is a considerable number of words in Scotch to which no historical origin can be assigned, for which no plausible derivation can be suggested. It would be rash in our present state of knowledge to declare that these words have sprung straight from the Scottish mind, for they may yet be traced. But if a complete list of these words of unknown origin were compiled and adequate labour employed to discover the roots, we should be in a better position to judge. Some slight exercise of this faculty is apparent in many of the compound words that abound in Scotch. Thus *kabbie-labbie*, *kebbie-lebbie*, *dibber-derry*, *hushel-bushel*, *hush-mush*, *haggerdash* and *haggerdecash*, *hurry-scurry* and *scurrie-whurrie*, *scheraggle* and *shirrarglie*, *bullic-hiezilie*, *fiery-fary*, *ding-dang*, *revel-ravel*, *bringle-brangle*, *hirdum-dirdum*, *hirdy-girdy*, *hullic-bullic*, and *hilliebalaw*, all express various forms of confusion, confused talking, brawling, and uproar. In the case of nearly all of them Teutonic words are to be met with that might account for the first or last of the components, but it is evident that one or other of them owes its origin to native instinct, and that the framers of the Scotch tongue have followed their own way in creating the combinations. Some of the words thus combined present themselves in various forms. Thus *nippertie-tippertie* and *hippertie-tippertie* are both applied to a light-minded girl, and *hippertie-skipperie* means 'to run in a frisky manner.' *Argle-bargle*, 'to contend or quarrel,' occurs in some districts as *argie-bargie*, or *aurple-bargin*, or possibly *eaggle-bargin*. Many of these compounds naturally denote different kinds of motion, as *hyter-styter*, 'to walk with a tottering step,' *stam-ram*, 'to walk with a reckless and rough step,' *dingle-dangle*, 'to sway backwards and forwards,' *whiltie-whaltie*, 'to palpitate,' and *tillie-wirlie*, 'a whirligig.' Others betoken endearment, as *manitoodlie*, *whittie-whattie*, and *peerieweeriewinkie*, and others imply contempt, as *dilly-dally*, 'to trifle,' and *figgle-faggle*, 'trifling conduct.' In this last sense Scotch has, in common with the English conversational language, several words, as *wishy-washy*, *fiddle-faddle*, *shilly-shally*, *whipper-snapper*, and *whimwham*. Others are applied to money transactions. Thus *hackum-*

plackum or *haukum-plaukum* is an adverb signifying that each one pays his own share at any kind of entertainment, especially the bill for drink at a tavern. Jamieson suggests the Anglo-Saxon *aelc*, 'each,' as the root of the first part, but it is more likely that *plackum* is the only intelligible part, and that *hackum* is prefixed, like a reduplication, to intimate the repeated laying down of the plack. A similar idea is expressed by the adjective *eeksie-peehsie*, 'perfectly alike,' where it is probable, as Jamieson suggests, that *eek* contains the idea of 'equal;' for the same idea is also expressed by the adjective *equal-equal*, and in this case we have the verb *equal-equal*, 'to balance accounts,' and the adverb *equals-equals*, 'in a strictly proportionate manner.'

In respect to grammar the tendency of all modern languages is to throw off inflections and bring out the connexion of words in a sentence by the order. English has gone further in this process than any other language, but the Scotch or Northern dialect was the first mover in this direction, and had parted with its inflections centuries before the Midland or literary dialect had taken such a step. It would not, however, be reasonable to expect consistency in a spoken language, and therefore it causes no surprise to stumble upon the oldest forms in the midst of daring innovations. The popular mind is led most of all by analogy, and, ignorant of the past, it introduces analogical forms irrespective of tradition. A slight glance at Scotch grammatical peculiarities will illustrate this fact.

The Scotch retains in the plural the *en* more frequently than English. Thus it has not merely *oxen* and *owsen*, but *shoon* for 'shoes,' *een*, 'cycs,' *hosen*, 'stockings;' and *housen*, 'houses,' *foen*, 'foes,' and such like, occur in old Scottish poetry.

In verbs Scotch does not hesitate to apply the *ed* termination of the past where English keeps to the old preterite, 'as 'I seed' for 'I saw,' 'I gaed' for 'I went,' from *gae*, 'to go.' It, however, retains many old preterites which have disappeared from English. Thus, it makes 'I lat' or 'I loot' the past of 'I let.'

Among the striking features of the Scotch verb must be reckoned the use of *s*, *be*, and *maun*. *S* may have three meanings, 'has,' 'is,' and to intimate futurity. Thus 'The man's bought a book' means 'The man has bought a book.' The *s* in the other uses is more peculiar. We find 'we is' in Barbour, and 'the kyc comes hame' in Hogg's well-known song, where *is* is first person plural and *comes* is third person plural.

This is in harmony with what occurs in the writers of the Northern English dialect, and 'I does' and 'we does' are common in Aberdeenshire.

Mr. Gregor in his 'Banffshire Dialect' sets down the past of 'to be' thus:—

I wiz	We wiz
Ye wiz	Ye wiz
He wiz	'They war.

Both in present and past there is thus a tendency to make the verb the same for all persons. This renders it likely, if not absolutely certain, that in the contracted expression, *I'se gawn hame*, 'I am going home,' the original form is 'I is 'gawn hame.' The future *s* is more liable to doubt. In Scotch one can say, 'I'se see you to-morrow' for 'I shall see you to-morrow,' and *se* can be affixed to all persons, *I'se*, *ye'se*, *he'se*, *it'se*, *we'se*, *ye'se*, *they'se*. What is this *se*? It may be derived from the word *shall*, which becomes in Scotch *sall*, and in some cases the *l* vanishes, as in *sanna* for *shall not*. But we doubt if the contracted word is not *is*, 'I'se be' for 'I is to be,' 'I am to be.'

The verb 'be' is certainly used in a strange way. *We be't do it* means 'We ought to do it,' or 'we cannot help doing 'it,' though it is generally past, 'We had to do it.' Here the full form is 'We be to do it,' 'It was ordained that we should 'do it.'

Scotch also employs very frequently the word *mann* for must. *We mann do it*, that is, 'We must do it.' It is the same for all persons. It is identical with the Icelandic *munu*, which has the same meaning as the Greek μέλλω, and, if Max Müller's opinion be correct, the same root.

Scotch is peculiarly rich in adjectives signifying 'very.' A thing may be *freely* good, *gey* good, *geyan* good, *sair* good, *rael* good, *deun* good, *doon* good, *bias* or *byous* good, and these are only a few of them. Some of these are confined to certain districts. 'Byous,' for instance, belongs to Aberdeenshire, and signifies 'out of the common,' 'extraordinarily.' After the comparative Scotch takes *nor* instead of 'than' (i.e., 'He was 'wiser nor Solomon'), reminding us of the Greek ἤ, the later and modern Greek ἀπό, and the negative clauses in French after comparatives.

Perhaps the most curious feature of Scotch grammar is one of the modes by which negation is predicated. It has some analogy with the French negative which consists of two words, *ne* and *pas* or *point* or *rien*. Corresponding to the *pas* (step), *point* (punctum), and *rien* (rem), there are in Scotch *bit*, *haet*

or *haid, mua, flow, guede, liung, sturn, yim*, or *nyim*, and some others, all signifying a very small portion of anything. An ordinary negative can be joined with any of these, as *ne'er a bit, neer a haet*, &c. But the strange feature of Scotch is that, instead of the negative, the Devil in any one of his numerous appellations may be inserted, and there is not merely a negation, but a strong negation, as *deil a bit, fient a bit, foul a ane*. It is frequent in Burns. Thus:—

‘ They loiter, lounging, lank an’ lazy;
 Tho’ deil haet ails them, yet uneasy,
 Their days insipid, dull an’ tasteless.’

‘Deil haet’ is here equivalent to ‘nothing.’

Most likely this is an elliptical expression, the full form being, ‘deil tak me if there is a bit,’ ‘deil tak me if haet ails me.’ The expression is modified when the individual wishes to tone it down and omit direct allusion to the Devil. It then becomes *dad a bit* or *sorrow a bit*. Several negatives have arisen in the same way, but the exact explanation of them is difficult. Such are *fundit haet*, possibly ‘confounded if it is,’ *blackbelickit, bladhaet, Runghaet, neerbelichit*. This introduction of the Devil into the grammar of the language is characteristic of the place which the Devil occupied in the Scotch mind. A list of names given him in Scotch would fill a page of this review, and an investigation into their origin would throw considerable light on the history and attitude of Scotch thought, and would bring out a close relationship between Scotland and Scandinavia. Some of the names go as far back as pagan times. The word *Heckelbirnie*, or *Heckiebirnie*, is used in imprecations, ‘I dinna care though ye were at ‘Hecklebirnie.’ Jamieson’s note on this subject is a good specimen of the diligence, learning, and sagacity with which he pursued his enquiries. We quote part of it:—

‘In Aberdeenshire this term has by some been resolved into *Hekla-burn-ye*. One might, indeed, almost suppose that this singular word contained some allusion to the Northern mythology. The only conjecture that I can offer in regard to it (while it must be acknowledged that it is mere conjecture) has this reference. We learn from the “Speculum Regale,” that it was an ancient tradition among the heathen, that the wicked were condemned to suffer eternal punishment in *Hecla*, the volcanic mountain in Iceland. Bartholin, in his “Caus. Contempt. Mort.,” p. 369, gives it as his opinion that those who introduced Christianity, along with the errors of that age, had viewed it as most subservient to their interest to suffer this idea to remain. As Su.-G. *brinna*, and Isl. *brenna*, signify to burn, the latter also signifying incendium, we might suppose that *Heckie-birnie* has been corrupted from *Hekla-brenna*, “the burning of Hekla.”’

Cleasby and Vigfusson in their Icelandic dictionary confirm this etymology. They say: 'In the Middle Ages Hecla became mythical in Europe, and was regarded as a place of punishment for the damned: the Danes say, "Begone to Heckenfjæld," the North Germans to "Hackelberg," the Scots to "John Hacklebirnie's house."'

It must be added, in order to explain the introduction of the Devil into ordinary speech, that the Scotch did not view the Devil with intense horror, though he unquestionably inspired fear. They thought of him rather as a strange wild being fond of playing cantrips, but who enjoyed boisterous and uproarious fun. He had a certain amount of humour in him, and therefore a certain amount of goodness, and so the idea was possible that he might 'tak' a thought an' men'. This idea still prevails. An advanced minister of the Church of Scotland expounded to his congregation the nature of the Revised Version of the New Testament and its superiority to the Authorised Version, and carried out his principles by repeating the Lord's Prayer according to the new translation. As the congregation was dismissing, an old woman was heard to say to her companion, 'Eh, they hae gien the puir auld body a grand lift by pittin' him into the Lord's Prayer.'

Turning from the grammar to changes in the vocables, we come upon instances of nearly every law of the science of language. But perhaps the most interesting are those changes which seem to contravene all law. The great mass of the illiterate are very much in the same state of mind in regard to long words as Mrs. Blower, in 'St. Ronan's Well,' was in regard to the name of Dr. Quackleben. It might be Cockerben or Cockleben, or any other similar sound; the one was as good as the other. Hence have arisen many changes which will not easily range themselves under any philological law. Thus *t* does not change into *r*, but in Scotch 'catechism' becomes *carritches*. The transformation is not difficult to explain. The *ch* in 'catechism' was pronounced as the *ch* in 'church.' Then 'catechism' lost its final *m* and passed into *catechis*, and probably getting associated with *parritch*, the one the daily spiritual, the other the daily corporal, food, *catechis* became *carritches*. Nor, according to philology, does *b* become *t*, yet in Scotch *oustrapalous* is commonly used instead of 'obstreperous.' The word is, indeed, liable to considerable disturbance, as it also appears in the forms of *abstrapalous* and *obstropolous*, and probably of *abstraklous*. The word *gil-ravage* signifies 'to hold a merry meeting with noise and riot but without doing injury to anyone.' It appears in a great

variety of forms, verbal and nominal, *gilraivitch*, *galravitch*, *guleravage*, *goravich*, *gilrevery*, *garraivery*, *garavitching*, and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to decide which is the correct form. Sometimes the corruptions become permanent in the language, as *cammass*, from 'canvas,' attached itself to a particular kind of coarse cloth, and sometimes they belong to the oddities of speech, as *tamteen*, in 'St. Rouan's Well,' for tontine. Many instances occur in which the popular mind reduces an unknown sound to a known one, as in the case of Welsh rabbit. Thus Michel, following Jamieson, explains *tartan purry* as being probably *tarte en purée*, and the cake called *petticoat tail* as *petit gâstel*. Some of the strange Scotch corruptions arise from the amalgamation of several words into one. Thus, *giest* is 'give us it,' *gwa* is 'go awa' (away), *fusticat?* is 'fu (how) shall I call it?' *fusticant?* 'how is it that they call it?' and *fraat* is 'for a' (all) that.'

Where there are such transformations, etymology encounters great difficulties, and certainty is scarcely attainable unless we can trace the words historically. The words for 'topsy-turvy' are very numerous, and nearly all incapable of full explanation. 'Topsy-turvy' itself is derived by Skeat from 'topside turfy,' or the topside going to the turf or ground. In Scotch, *heelsterheads*, *heels o'er heads*, *heels o'er gordie*, *tapirtail*, *tapsie-teerie*, *tapsalteerie*, *hiddie-giddie*, *hirdy-girdy*, *hiraum-girdum*, *hilliegeleerie* or *hecliegoleerie*, all have this meaning. In *heelsterheads* we have evidently a contraction of 'heels o'er heads,' with an epenthetic *t* to fill up the sound. *Tapirtail* can scarcely be explained in any other way than 'tap (Scotch for top) over tail.' If this is the case, then we have a transmutation of *over* into *o'er*, and then into *eer*, and it seems to us not improbable that we have, in all the words ending in *erie*, this same transmuted *over*. In the case of *tapsie-teerie* we have an instance of a phenomenon not unknown to English, and of which several instances occur in Scotch. In English the word adder comes from A.S. *nædre*, and ought to have an *n*, but the *n* got attached to the article, and a nadder became an adder. *Neddar* or *nedder* means, in Scotch, an adder. In Scotch, *lammer beads* is beads made of amber, and *l* of the *lammer* can scarcely be anything else than the French article, which has become part of the word. So in *tapsie-teerie* the *t* of the *teerie* belongs to *tapsie*, and the component parts are *tap* (or top), *sit*, same as German *seite* and English *side*, and *overy*, topside overy. *Tapsalteerie* is probably the same word. *Tap* and *erie* are the same. *Salt* is in all likelihood the same as *sit* or *side*. The insertion of the *l* is strange, but it is not

uncommon in Scotch. *Walx* occurs for wax, *walter* for water, *culpis* for cups, *rolk* for rock, and *palp* for pap. There is no etymological reason for this *l*. It is a mere euphonious caprice of the speaker. The *leerie* in *heeliegoleerie* may also be supposed to contain the *over* with affixed *l*, and then the words are *heelie* (diminutive of heel), go over, but recourse has been had to Gaelic, *uiel go leir*, ‘altogether.’ *Hirdum-girdum* and *hirdy-girdy* are regarded as mere corruptions of *hiddie-giddy*, that is, with the head in a giddy state. ‘*Heels o’er gowdy*’ has not received any satisfactory explanation.

The normal phenomena of the Scotch language have not been sufficiently investigated. It is likely that, if a tolerably complete list of the words that are common to English, Scotch, Anglo-Saxon, Icelandic, Norwegian, Danish, Dutch, Flemish, and German were made, some curious facts would emerge. In the meantime we call attention only to the marked features of Scotch, comparing them principally with English, but sometimes with one or other of the cognate languages.

The Scotch has a strong preference for the vowel *a*. Unquestionably this results from a conservative tendency, for the *a* occurs in the earliest forms of language. But the Scotch is often led through analogy to extend the *a* where it did not exist. In English *o* has taken the place of the *a*. Thus—

Anglo-Saxon	Icelandic	English	Scotch	Latin
snáw	snær	snow	sna	niv-
blawan		blow	bla	fla-
ráw		row	raw	
oft		oft, often	aft, aften	
swa	sva	so	sa and sae	
gan		go	gae	
fam		foam	faem	
gast		ghost	gaist	
ác	eik	oak	aik	
an	einn	one	ane	

Scotch sometimes has an *o* or some other letter where English and cognate languages have an *a*. This may arise from a motive that works obscurely, but has had great influence in modifying sounds. Persons get tired of pronouncing words in the same way as their neighbours, and to relieve the burden of monotony alter the sound. In some cases, however, an etymological reason can be given, as in the Scotch *loup*.

Anglo-Saxon	Icelandic	English	Scotch
		blaze	bleeze
		many	mony
		any	ony
hleapen	hlaupa	leap	loup
		let	lat and loot

Sometimes the *oo* of English is represented by *ee*, as

English	Scotch
root	reet
brow	bree

The *a* sound in 'take' is represented by *a* sound of 'bat' in Scotch:—

English	Scotch
break	brak
take	tak
spake	spak
shake	shak

The tendency in dealing with the consonants is to reduce the word to the shortest form in which it will be fully intelligible and adequately expressive. The most frequent is the omission of *l*, a characteristic also of French words derived from Latin, as *chaud*, from *calidus*:—

E. folk, S. *fouk*; E. gold, S. *gowd*; E. stolen, S. *stoun*; E. poll, S. *pou*; E. hollow, S. *howe*; E. knoll, S. *knowe*; E. bolster, S. *bowster*; E. fallen, S. *faen*; E. fault, S. *faut*; E. salt, S. *saut*; E. shoulder, S. *shouther*; E. solder, S. *souther*; E. soldier, S. *soyer*; E. shall not, S. *sauna*.

The omission of *v* or *b* is also frequent, as in Latin *nobilis* from *novibilis*:—

E. gable, S. *gail* or *gale*; E. oven, S. *oon* or *une*; E. harvest, S. *hearst*; E. forward, S. *forrat*; E. week, S. *ook*; E. haven, S. *hain*; E. uppermost, S. *umost*; E. serve, S. *sair*; E. savour, S. *sair*; E. marvel, S. *marle*.

Sometimes the change is great, as *darg* is for day-work or a day's work, and *hizzie* is for housewife. Sometimes a *v* is inserted, as *I div* for 'I do,' *I divna ken*, 'I do not know.' Occasionally other letters are omitted in the middle of words, such as *k* and *th*:—

E. taken, S. *taen*; E. asked, S. *ast*; E. smother, S. *smoor*.

On the other hand, *k* sometimes makes its appearance where there is no *k* in English, as in *sclander*, *slave*, *sclate*, and *sclender*. In all of these except the last the *k* is in the root, as seen in old French, *esclandre*, *esclave*, and *esclat*.

Many letters are thrown off at the end of words, especially *l*, *d*, and *k*:—

E. fall, S. *fa*; E. wall, S. *wa*; E. ball, S. *ba*; E. call, S. *ca*; E. full, S. *fu*; E. small, S. *sma*; E. hand, S. *han*; E. land, S. *lan*; E. mind, S. *mine*; E. find, S. *fin*; E. make, S. *ma*.

But the process is not confined to these letters:—

E. ashes, S. *as*; E. bush, S. *bus*; E. visit, S. *visy*; E. mouth, S. *mou*; E. guide, S. *gy*; E. more, S. *ma* or *mae*.

Frequently also there is a transposition of the letter *r*. In this case the Scotch order is often that of the root:—

E. scratch, S. *scart*; E. grass, S. *girs*; E. burnt, S. *brunt*; E. grin, S. *girn*; E. gristle, S. *girsle*; E. truss, S. *turs*; E. great, S. *girt*.

Very frequently *d* is found where English has *th*, as in *faddir*, *middir*, *boddum*, *forgaddir*, for father, mother, bottom, and for-gather. In the same way Scotch has a *k* or *g* where English has *ch* or *dg*, as

E. birch, S. *birk*; E. church, S. *kirk*; E. match, S. *maik*; E. thatch, S. *thak*; E. stitch, S. *steek*; E. chaff, S. *cauf*; E. churn, S. *kirn*; E. bridge, S. *brig*; E. ridge, S. *rig*.

Onion, opinion, St. Ninian, companion, are pronounced ingan, opingan, Ringan, compangon, and poison and foison (from French) (Latin *potio* and *fusio*) are pronounced pooshin and fushin.

Scotch contains a great number of instances where the initial letter or syllable is cut off.

E. tobacco, S. *bakie*; E. potato, S. *tatie*; E. turnips, S. *neeps*; E. embrace, S. *brais*; E. againcome, S. *gaincome*; E. begin, began, S. *gin*, *gan*; E. decoy, S. *goy*; E. excuses, S. *seuses*; E. interrogate, S. *larogat*; E. arrest, S. *reist*; E. disguise, S. *guise*; E. defile, S. *jile*; E. amazement, S. *mazement*; E. indite, S. *dite*; E. yestereven, S. *yes-treen*, *streen*.

Not so frequent, but still numerous, are the instances where the final syllable or syllables are cut off, as

E. Parliamentary cakes (a kind of gingerbread), S. *parlies*; E. gingerbread, S. *ginch*; E. confederate, S. *confeder*; E. confiscate, S. *confiske*; E. strawberries, S. *strawers*; E. spatterdasher, S. *spats*.

We should not do justice to our subject, if we did not notice a few of the peculiarities which mark the strangest of Scotch dialects—that of Aberdeenshire. The most striking one is the continual use of the sound of *f* for *wh*: ‘who’ becomes *fa*, ‘when’ *fan*, ‘whether’ *fudder*, ‘whip’ *fup*. ‘Fa fuppit the fuppie?’ means ‘who whipped the whelp?’ Then the *u* or *ui* sound in other Scotch dialects is replaced by the sound *ee*. Thus ‘school’ becomes *squeel*, ‘good’ *gweed*, ‘alone’ *aleen*, ‘none’ *neen*. ‘Fa’ts the eese o’ that?’ means ‘what is the use of that?’ The *w* receives the sound of *v*, and ‘wright’ becomes *vricht*, ‘write’ *vrite*, ‘wrong’ *vrang*. The *a* becomes *ai*: ‘master’ *maister*, ‘cart’ *cairt*. *At* is regularly used for ‘that,’ the relative, and *nain* is often em-

ployed for 'own.' The dialect abounds in diminutives, and has also a number of augmentative terminations. The diminutives occur in every sentence and are heaped one on another. The first degree of diminution is by the termination *ie*, as 'dog,' *doggie*, 'chap,' *chappie*, 'lass,' *lassie*. The diminution becomes greater by adding *ikie*, which in all probability is derived from *ock*, also a diminutive termination, made more diminutive by *ie*. Thus 'lass' becomes *lassie* and *lassock*, and out of *lassock* comes *lassikie*. And this can be intensified to several degrees of diminutiveness by prefixing the adjectives *wee* and *little*, 'a little wee bit lassikie,' and Mr. Gregor gives as Banffshire 'a wee wee bit nyaff o' a doggie.' Another peculiar feature of Aberdeenshire is the use of 'terrible' like the Greek *δεινός*, as 'He is terribly clever.'

The Aberdeenshire dialect would well repay a thorough examination, and the means of carrying it out are not far to seek. There exists a considerable literature written in the dialect from the earliest times, which is still receiving additions. One writer, the author of *Johnny Gibb of Gushetneuk*, deserves special mention, for his books are a mine of pure Aberdeenshire words and phrases, and his pictures of Aberdeenshire life are instinct with genius and as true to nature as they are interesting.

Jamieson's Dictionary is a storehouse of linguistic and antiquarian facts, and could supply materials for many articles. We have but dipped into it, and that too only in one direction. It is to be hoped that the subject will attract the attention of the learned, and that a band of competent scholars will correct and arrange Jamieson's accumulations by the light of modern linguistic science and incorporate with them the researches that have been recently made or may still be made before the language ceases to be spoken. But in the meantime the republication of the Dictionary and the supplements in these handsome volumes is creditable to those who have executed the task, and it forms a valuable addition to our libraries.

ART. VI.—*The Herefordshire Pomona.* Containing Coloured Figures and Descriptions of the most esteemed kinds of Apples and Pears. Edited by ROBERT HOGG, LL.D., F.L.S., &c., for the Woolhope Club. Parts I. to V. folio. London and Hereford: 1878–1882.

OF all the fruit-trees which our country produces, there is none more generally serviceable to man or more deservedly held in high repute than the apple-tree. It will thrive in climates which are too cold for the pear, the cherry, and the plum. It is more than any other fruit-tree adapted for general cultivation, whether in the garden of the squire or in that of the humble cottager. No tree affords a more generally useful, wholesome, palatable, and continuous supply of fruit than the apple-tree. It may be had, in some variety or other, nearly all the year round, from the early sorts of June and July to those of the late autumn and winter months; and these, by careful preservation, may be kept available for food almost until the succeeding summer crops are ready for gathering. Certainly, when we reflect on the usefulness of the apple, whether for kitchen purposes, for dessert, for the production of cider, and in confectionery, we cannot wonder that this tree has long been held in the highest esteem, and that great attention has been and is still being bestowed on the cultivation of its numerous and almost infinite varieties. The beauty and delicate fragrance of the blossoms—unsurpassed, we think, by those of other trees—delight in spring, the loaded fruit add a charm to the autumn. In the cheerless winter how attractive are ‘the apples of gold’ as they help to decorate the dessert-table or gratify the palates of the guests as they sit around the welcome fire! These charm on account of their size and beauty; these for their excellent flavour—of varied quality, some being almost lusciously sweet, others having a brisk acidity; others again are notable for a combination of commendable qualities in form, size, colour, crispness, and flavour. And yet almost all the innumerable cultivated varieties of the apple come of humble origin, even of the despised wild *crab* of our fields and woodlands—a name suggestive only of sourness, moroseness, and ill-temper! But what may not cultivation effect? Nature has her ways, themselves often variable, and art can alter, improve, and multiply variations to an almost endless extent:

‘Hos natura modos primum dedit: his genus omne
Sylvarum, fruticumque viret, nemorumque sacrorum.
Sunt alii, quos ipse viâ sibi repperit usus.’

Conspicuous amongst the cultivators of our fruit-trees stands the name of Thomas Andrew Knight, who during the first quarter of the present century 'stood at the head of scientific horticulture in Great Britain.' A very interesting account of the life of Knight and his work in the orchard appears in the First Part of the 'Herefordshire Pomona' now in course of publication, which we have placed at the head of this article, and which is the subject of our consideration. Pliny,* in his chapter (*De diversis generibus malorum*) 'On various Kinds of Fruits,' asks: 'Why should I hesitate to mention some other varieties of fruits by name, seeing that they have conferred everlasting remembrance on those who introduced them as having rendered some eminent service in their lives? Unless I am deceived,' he adds, 'thereby will appear the ingenuity of man in the art of grafting (*ingenium inserendi*), for there is no matter, however small, from which some honour may not be obtained.' He then goes on to mention various names of apples or other fruits, such as the Matian, Cestian, Mallian apples, &c., which derived their names from individuals; and lest his readers should imagine that the names were given to the fruits simply on account of the high birth of the introducers of the respective varieties, or in the spirit of flattery to an illustrious name, he makes especial mention of the Sceptian apple, so called from a freedman (*libertinus*), its inventor. Pliny's remarks are just, and they are quite applicable in the case of Knight, who, in this country at all events, was the first to introduce a systematic hybridisation of fruits, which has since been so successfully carried out by German, French, and English growers. Knight published his '*Pomona Herefordiensis*, or descriptive account of the old cider and perry fruits of Herefordshire, which have always been esteemed the best of their kind, with such new fruits as have been found to possess superior excellence, accompanied by highly finished coloured engravings, under the patronage of the Agricultural Society of Hereford,' in 1811. The original drawings for this work are now in the Free Library and Museum at Hereford. There are about thirty plates, and the drawings were executed by the late Miss Matthews of Belmont, with the exception of three which are the work of Miss Knight of Downton Castle, the late Mrs. Stackhouse Acton of Acton Scott. Much has been done in horticulture since Knight's time, and with the most praiseworthy enterprise the Woolhope Club is now bringing out an entirely new work on

* Nat. Hist. xv. 14.

British apples and pears, with numerous splendidly coloured engravings of the varieties, and an admirable and full description of the same, together with some very exhaustive and valuable essays on subjects relating to the Pomona, whether historically, scientifically, or practically considered. The technical descriptions are by Dr. Hogg, whose name is well known in the horticultural world; the essays are the work of several pens, but the chief merit of the whole is undoubtedly due to Dr. Bull of Hereford, whose practical knowledge and scientific acquirements, coupled with a patience and enthusiasm beyond all praise, are conspicuous everywhere throughout the whole work. The drawings, which are characterised by a lifelike representation of the fruits, blossoms, and sprays, and admirable colouring, are the work of Miss Ellis of Hereford and Miss Edith Bull, one of the Doctor's accomplished daughters, who have gratuitously rendered their valuable assistance. The chromo-lithographs are, we think, the best we have ever seen, and reflect great credit on the skill and artistic capabilities of M. G. Severeys of Brussels. The cost of the whole work is of necessity great, and we trust that in time its sale will be such as to exonerate the members of the Woolhope Club from the very heavy expenses incurred, although 'the Club has 'neither the intention nor desire to make any profit from its 'publication.' Let us now consider a few of the many interesting points which the 'Herefordshire Pomona' brings before our notice.

The introductory essay on the early history of the apple and pear is from the pen of Dr. Bull, and is replete with interesting matter. It is not easy to say who was the happy individual who first tasted a really good apple or a juicy delicious pear. The best fruit of modern days is the result of careful selected cultivation, extending over, it may be, some centuries past. The idea that the apple tree is of Eastern origin, however, may be safely, we think, dismissed, so far as Palestine is concerned. It is true that our English word 'apples' and 'apple-tree' occur in our Bibles, but there is every probability that the Hebrew word תַּפְּוֹחַ (*tappûach*) does not mean 'apple.' The Septuagint and the Vulgate give *μῆλον* and *malum*, but this affords no clue, because both the Greek and the Latin words are used to denote various kinds of fruit, as citrons, peaches, quinces, apples, &c. 'The apples 'throughout Syria are poor and small, with an insipid sweetness; and it has been within some extensive observation of 'our own, that good apples are never to be found in countries 'warm enough or too warm to produce the grape in perfec-

‘tion.’* Sir Joseph Hooker, when in Palestine some years ago, heard from three authorities that the finest apples in Syria grew at Joppa and Askalon. ‘The fact,’ he writes, ‘appeared so improbable, that, though one authority had eaten them, I could not resist prosecuting the enquiry, and at last found a gentleman who had property there, and knew a little of horticulture, who assured me they were all *quinces*, the apples being abominable.’ It is true that the apple is now cultivated with success in the higher parts of Lebanon, out of the boundaries of the Holy Land, yet, as Tristram observes, it barely exists in the country itself. The *tappûach* of the Hebrew Bible requires that it should be sweet to the taste, fragrant and restorative, and afford some shade. Perhaps, as Tristram has conjectured, the apricot has the best claim to represent the *tappûach* of the Old Testament Scriptures. We cannot therefore accept Dr. Thomson’s explanation that the apple is denoted. This writer’s apples which he saw at Askelon, and ‘which would not have disgraced an American orchard,’ were doubtless quinces. The apple is in its wild state more or less sour, and its pleasant sweetness is due to cultivation, an art to which the ancient Hebrews paid little if any attention so far as relates to horticulture: so that Palestine is not the land where we should expect to find this fruit in early times.

If we turn to the classical authors of Greece and Rome, we still meet with great uncertainties, generally speaking. The Greek word *μήλον*, Doric *μάλον*, whence the Latin *malum*, denotes ‘tree fruit’ generally, but the same word also signifies ‘sheep.’ The passage in the ‘Odyssey’ (vii. 112-131) which tells of Ulysses’ visit to Alcinous, king of the Phæacians, a luxurious and sensual people who dwelt in the island of Scheria, a fabulous folk of a fabulous land, and recounts the beauties of the large garden (*μέγας ὄρχατος*) in which grew pear, pomegranate, and apple trees, &c., of never-failing fruit, where ‘pear after pear grows old, apple after apple, grape after grape, and fig after fig,’ is too mythical for practical information. Vain, too, would it be to seek for any definite fruit in the famed myth of the golden apples of the Hesperides. But, abandoning the poets, there is very little in the writings of the Greek prose authors which supplies any definite information on the growth and cultivation of the apple. One naturally turns to Theophrastus, the pupil of Plato and Aristotle, to whom the latter bequeathed his library and the originals of his writings. The ‘History of Plants’ is one of

* Kitto, Phys. Hist. of Palestine, p. 272.

the earliest books on botany which have come down to us. Under the terms *μηλέα* and *μῆλον* Theophrastus speaks of both apples and quinces; but although there is a probability that apples are sometimes intended, there is not a single passage in the whole of his works that would enable one to say positively that apples or apple-trees are definitely spoken of. The clearest indication is in his chapter 'On Colours,' § 37, where he says the blossom of the *μηλέα* is 'white with a tinge of red,' and that the fruit is 'yellow' (τὸ μὲν ἄνθος ἐστὶ λευκὸν ἐπιπορφυρίζον, ὁ δὲ καρπὸς ξανθός), but even this would apply to the quince. It is certainly probable that some attention was paid to the cultivation of apples and pears in the time of Theophrastus, for he says that these trees do not naturally grow with one stem only, but are made to do so by training (τῇ ἀγωγῇ), the lateral branches being cut off (παραιρουμένων τῶν ἄλλων).

Apples and pears sometimes made their appearance on the dessert tables of the Greeks; thus Clearchus, in Athenæus (xiv. 60), mentions 'dried figs, pears (*ἄπιος*), and peaches, 'apples (*μῆλα*), and almonds.' The presence of a dish of pears on the table of the Deipnosophists gives occasion for a certain guest to exhibit his knowledge on the subject:—

'I will now speak of the pears (*ἄπιον*) which I see before me, because from this fruit the Peloponnesus derived its name and was called *Ἀπία*, for pears were abundant in this country, as Ister tells us.* It was customary to bring up pears in water at entertainments, as we learn from the Brentias of Alexis in the lines "A. Have you ever seen pears floating in a quantity of water set before hungry men? B. Often indeed, what then? A. Does not each man always take out the ripest pear that floats before him? B. Doubtless he does."'

Passing over the few scattered notices of apples and pears which occur in the writings of the Latin poets, we come to something more generally interesting to the antiquarian and horticulturist in the works of the Roman writers on husbandry, as Cato, Columella, and Palladius, and in the 'Natural History' of the elder Pliny. It must be remembered that these writers *de Re rustica* are separated by considerable intervals of time: Cato was born 234 B.C.; Columella was a contemporary of Seneca, and lived about the time of Christ; Palladius probably belongs to the middle of the fourth century of the

* *Apia* is the name given by Homer to the Peloponnesus; and the derivation of the Deipnosophist in Athenæus is a mere fancy. There is no doubt that the country was called *Apia* from *Apis*, the Pelasgian adventurer, who is recorded to have established a government in the Peloponnesus.

Christian era. We will content ourselves with what the earliest and latest of these writers on Roman husbandry have left us regarding the cultivation of apples. Cato (cap. xlvi.) says apple-trees are to be treated after the same manner as olive-trees; each cutting must be set according to the kind of tree. The following are the rules to be observed: turn the ground with a double-pronged fork; plant in early spring; dig trenches five feet wide; supply with manure; hoe the ground carefully; crumble the soil; make a smooth trench, not too deep; plant thickly in a line; riddle the earth to a finger deep; smooth it with a board or with the feet; surround with stakes, and support with props; lay over brush-wood or fig-fascines to keep out the sun and the cold; arrange so that a man may walk underneath; weed out, and remove growing herbage.

Flower-pots appear to have been in use amongst the ancient Romans, and to have been not dissimilar in form to those of modern days. In a chapter on the cultivation of apple and other trees Cato tells us that scions (*pulli*) must be taken from the trees and pressed into the soil in an upright position, so that they may take root. He says the cuttings must be taken from the top of the tree (Columella, however, considers these to be the worst). ‘Those kinds which you are particularly anxious about should be planted in pots with holes in them’ (*calicibus pertusis*) or in small baskets filled with soil; when two years old the branch below should be cut off, and the young tree planted with the pot in the ground. Every kind of tree should be similarly treated in order that it may take root well.

Palladius (iii. cap. xxv.) has a long and interesting chapter on the treatment and preservation of apples and pears, and it is probable that the art of horticulture had made some considerable progress in his time. Speaking of pears he recommends February as the best month for planting, if the locality be a cold one, but November if it be a warm one, so that the young trees should benefit by a watered soil. A soil suited to vineyards is suited to pears; a fertile soil produces strong trees and abundant fruit. Pears are thought to change their stony nature by being planted on a soft soil. The result of sowing pears, he adds, is a slow process; man has a long time to wait, and pears from seed deteriorate from the excellency of their kind.* It is better, therefore, to plant young trees in Novem-

* This reminds one of the old English expression, ‘He that plants pears plants for his heirs.’

ber in well-prepared trenches; a space of thirty feet should separate the trees, and the ground should be frequently stirred and watered even till the blossoms appear. After a year a supply of dung should be given; ox's dung is supposed to produce the heaviest crops; ashes are sometimes mixed with the dung under the idea that thereby the fruit derives some acidity. If a tree looks sickly (*languida*), you should pierce the root and insert a piece of wood or of pinewood into the trunk; if pinewood be not at hand, you may use a plug of oak. Worms are destroyed and prevented by frequent washings of the roots with bull's gall; the fresh lees of old wine applied to the roots will hasten the blossoms.

On the grafting of pears Palladius recommends that this should be done in February or March; the graft must be made under the bark in the trunk. The trees on which the graft may be made are the wild pear, the apple, according to some on the almond and white thorn (*Crataegus*), or as Virgil recommends, on the ash and citron, or, as others say, on the cleft wood of the pomegranate. The grafting of the apple on the pear, or *vice versâ*, seems to have been a favourite method. Thus again Palladius:—

‘ Insita proceris pergit conerescere ramis,
Et sociam mutat malus amica pirum,
Seque feros silvis hortatur linquere mores,
Et partu gaudet nobiliore frui.’ *

The Romans paid much attention to the preservation of their apples and pears so as to last for useful purposes long after they were gathered. Pears should be gathered for keeping on a calm day, as the moon decreases from the twenty-second to the eighth day; they should be hand-picked when dry, whole, nearly hard, taken from those about to fall, and somewhat green; they should then be enclosed in a covered pitched vessel with the mouth inclining downwards and buried in a damp place. Those which are hard in flesh and enticle should be first placed in a heap where they will begin to soften, then put into a well-baked earthen vessel, and covered with pitch, the top being secured by plaster; the whole is then buried in a small trench in a place exposed to the sun. Many preserve pears by burying them with chaff or corn; others, directly they are gathered, bury them with their stalks in pitched vessels, the mouths of which are covered with plaster or pitch; the whole is then covered with coarse sand in the open air. Others separate the pears and preserve in honey.

* De Insit. 77–80.

Others boil salt water, which they skim as it begins to seethe (*cum cœperit undare calefacta*), and immerse the pears to be preserved just after the water cools; then after a little time they take them out and place in vessels, the mouths of which are covered with plaster; a night and day they remain in the cold salt water; afterwards they soften them for two days in pure water, and finally preserve them in must or dried grape wine or sweet wine. The main object apparently was to exclude the air in most of these cases.

The perry (*vinum de piris*) of the Romans consisted of bruised pears put into a very thin bag and pressed with weights or in a winepress; it was in fact nothing but the expressed juice of the fruit, at least according to Palladius's receipt. Of course such pear wine would not keep except in cold winter weather, and so our author expressly adds, 'hieme durat, sed 'prima acescit æstate'—it will keep in the winter, but turns acid with the first warmth of summer.

Pear vinegar was made as follows:—Wild pears, or pears of a coarse sort, were to be placed when ripe in a heap for three days, then into a vessel with spring or rain water; the vessel was to be left uncovered for thirty days; as much vinegar as was required for use was to be taken out, and so much water added. A peculiar drink, called *liquamen castimoniale*, 'temperance pear-wine' (?), was made by treading very ripe pears mixed with salt; when the flesh was broken up, they were buried in small casks or in earthen vessels covered with pitch. After three months this gives a liquor of pleasant flavour, of a whitish colour. For this kind of wine it was desirable to add, at the time the pears were pressed, a certain proportion of dark wine.

Pliny tells us that the use of the Latin word *mala* was not restricted to apples, but belonged to other kinds of fruit, as peaches, pomegranates, &c. He mentions several varieties of apples and pears, some of which derive their names from the localities where they were first known, others from individuals who had the credit of introducing them, and others again from some peculiarity in their appearance—such as *melapia*, 'apple-pears; ' *mustea*, 'new-wine apples,' from their ripening early like our summer fruit; *melimela*, 'honey apples; ' *orbiculata*, 'globe apples; ' *pannucea*, 'ragged apples,' from their wrinkled appearance, &c. He is apparently speaking of the crab in its most acid mood when he says some apples are peculiarly bad, and sour enough to turn the edge of a sword. 'Id peculiare improbitatis et acerbitatis convicium, et vis tanta, 'ut aciem gladii perstringat' (xv. 15). The remarks of Pliny

de pomis servandis are simply condensed from the works on Roman husbandry from which we have given some extracts above.

Passing from Greece and Italy to our own country, there is great reason to believe that the people of the latter country found apples growing here at the time of Cæsar's invasion, though, as Dr. Bull says, we have no actual record of the fact. The ancient Britons probably knew little of apples beyond the sour crab, and the Romans probably brought with them the varieties of fruit they had been accustomed to use in Italy.

'They ever loved to surround themselves with the plants of their own country, and it is to them we owe the introduction of the elm, the box, the walnut, the cherry, and the pear. The coarse pot-herb Alexanders (*Smyrnium olusatrum*) is generally found in the neighbourhood of Roman earthworks, and unwittingly they brought the Roman nettle (*Urtica pilulifera*) which still haunts some of the ruined Roman stations in England. From the districts in which the Romans settled, the fruit there would gradually spread through the country. In the third century the Romans obtained permission, it is said, of the Emperor Probus to introduce the vine into Britain, and soon made wine from the fruit.'

As other invaders came into this country, the native Britons, now through the Romans having some knowledge of apple-culture, would carry with them their varieties of apples into remote regions. That this took place during the fifth and sixth centuries there is some evidence to show. The native Britons, harassed by the Saxons, took refuge amongst the mountains of Wales, and from thence many fled to the north-west coast of France, viz. to Armorica, now called Brittany from the very fact of this migration. That the Normandy cider apples were introduced from England by British monks is attested by the 'Liber Landavensis' on the English side, and by Montalembert in his 'Les Moines d'Occident' on the French. In the latter work it is said that the British monk Teilo 'planted with his own hands, assisted by St. Samson, 'an immense orchard, a true forest of fruit-trees, three miles 'in extent, in the neighbourhood of Dôl;' and the fact is attested by the 'Liber Landavensis' in nearly the same words. According to tradition the planting of this large orchard first led to the manufacture of cider in Normandy, a beverage which some centuries afterwards attained great celebrity. In process of time apple orchards became extremely common in England. From the time of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity for several centuries up to the four-

teenth century the cultivation of fruit was chiefly carried on by the monks. Fish and fruit entered largely into the diet of the people in those days; and to the ecclesiastics they were indebted for the fishponds and gardens they established wherever they dwelt.

‘The monks were men of peace and study, and living in retired spots depended upon their gardens for much of their food. Through ages of war and bloodshed they pursued their peaceful avocations, and cultivated the soil with sedulous industry. Many a monk, like Scott’s Abbot Boniface of Kennequhair, has found great pleasure in the pears and apples he had grafted with his own hands. The “abbey garden” is always observed to occupy the best and most sheltered situation that could be found, and by their foreign connexions the monks were enabled to obtain, from more favourable climates, not only better kinds of vegetables and more choice fruits for their delectation, but also valuable medicinal herbs for the treatment of the sick poor in their neighbourhood. The ruins of most of the old abbeys afford, to this day, proofs of the care bestowed by their former inhabitants in introducing foreign plants. From the gardens attached to these institutions they have often been found by botanists to wander into the neighbouring fields and woods. Asarabacca (*Asarum europæum*), recently found by the Woolhope Club in the forest of Deerfold, is one of these medicinal plants. Thorn-apple (*Datura Stramonium*), stinking groundsel (*Senecio squalidus*), and the plant always grown in nunnery gardens (*Aristolochia clematitis*) are other examples, and more might be mentioned. As early as 674 there is a record that Brithnot, the first Abbot of Ely, laid out extensive gardens and orchards, which he “planted with a great variety of herbs, shrubs, and fruit-trees. In a few years the trees which he planted and engrafted appeared at a distance like a wood, loaded with the most excellent fruits in great abundance, and added much to the commodiousness and beauty of the place.”’

We know that there were many varieties of apples grown in England, both cultivated and wild, as early as the twelfth century, but their names have perished with two curious exceptions, viz. the pearmain and the costard apple. The first appears in a legal deed in the sixth year of King John (1205): ‘Robert de Everme was found to hold his lordship of Redham and Stokesley, in Norfolk, by petty serjeantry, the paying of 200 pearmaines, and four hogsheads (*modios*) of wine made of pearmaines into the excheque, on the Feast of St. Michael yearly.’ Drayton in his ‘Polyolbion’ writes:—

‘The pearmain which to France long ere to us was known;
Which careful fruiterers now have denizen’d our own;’

and the word bespeaks its French origin.

The ‘costard apple’ is mentioned in the fruiterers’ bills of Edward I. (1292), when it was sold for one shilling the hundred

under the name of 'poma costard.' It is curious to note that this costard apple gives us the original meaning of our word *coster* in the compound costermonger, 'an itinerant seller of 'fruit.' Formerly the word was spelt *costerd-* or *costard-monger*, and Professor Skeat tells us that in Drant's *Horæe* the former spelling occurs as the translation of *pomarius* in Sat. ii. 3, 227. In the 'Promptorium Parvulorum' (p. 94) costard is explained by 'appulle,' *quirianum*. Drant's lines run thus:—

'The prodigall, by witte worde hath
Ten talentes : in his heate
He biddes the costerdmongers and
Thappothyearies neate.'

In Shakespeare's time the costermonger appears to have been specially the fruit-seller, for Ford, the dramatist (born 1586), makes one of his characters say, 'Upon my life he means to 'turn *costermonger*, and is projecting how to forestall the market. 'I shall cry pippins rarely.'* The etymology of the word *costard*, however, still remains to be explained. The name of costermonger shows at any rate that apples at this time were extensively grown and used.

The use of some drink made from apples and pears would probably be, in some instances, almost contemporary with the cultivation of those fruits, and we have already noticed the pear wines (if they deserved such a name) of Palladius's receipts. That cider was used in early English times, at least in the thirteenth century, there is clear evidence to show; and though the quality of mediæval cider was doubtless very poor drink compared with the cider of Herefordshire and Devonshire, it was probably extensively consumed.

'The history of the apple during the middle ages is chiefly to be gleaned from the incidental notices with reference to cider which have come down to us. From these scant notices it would appear that the manufacture of cider was not confined to certain districts as it now is, since but little was known of the influence of the soil, or its quality, in those days. Where apples grew and drink was scarce, cider was made. The first distinct notice of it as being made in England was in Norfolk; the next we have is in Yorkshire. "In 1282 the bailiff of Cowick, near "Richmond [North Riding of Yorkshire], stated in his account that he "had made sixty gallons of cider from three quarters and a half of "apples. In these days no one would think of making it so far north. "In Scotland it seems never to have been made or used to any extent.'"

It seems uncertain at what date cider began to be much used in Herefordshire, now so famous for this beverage. In the

* 'The Sun's Darling,' act iv. sc. 1.

‘Roll of the Household Expenses of Bishop Swinfield’ (thirteenth century) no mention is made of cider, and ‘since both beer and wine are very frequently mentioned in it, it affords the strongest negative testimony against the existence of orchards and the making of either cider or perry in Herefordshire at that time.’

The mention of *sider* in Wycliffe’s ‘Bible,’ * to which reference is made in the ‘Pomona,’ † conveys no information as to whether cider was known to Wycliffe or his followers, ‘who are known to have lived for several years in seclusion in the wilds of Deerfold Forest, North Herefordshire.’ It is not a question whether the word ‘sider’ *may* be a translation of *σίκερα* (not *σίχερα*): it is clearly the representative of the Greek word, which itself is from the Hebrew שֵׁכָר (*shêcar*), ‘strong drink.’ In Middle English the word is variously spelt *sicer*, *cyder*, *sythir*. The allusion is to the passage in the Vulgate: ‘Cave ne vinum bibas nec *siceram*.’ ‡ Wycliffe’s version is not the only one which gives *sidir* instead of ‘strong drink’ in Luke i. 15; the Rheims version (1582) has the passage ‘and vvine and *sicer* he shal not drinke.’

Dr. Bull gives several quotations from Shakespeare, who draws some of his admirable similes from apples and pears. Two of Shakespeare’s apples may be identified with well-known modern varieties. ‘I am withered like an old apple-john.’ § ‘What the devil hast thou brought there? Apple-johns? Thou know’st Sir John cannot endure an apple-john.’ || Falstaff could not bear the idea of being considered ‘a dry, round, old withered knight.’ The apple-john is the *winter greening* of Dr. Hogg’s ‘Fruit Manual,’ which will keep for two years, but gets very dry and shrivelled.

‘There’s a dish of leather-coats for you!’ says Davy to Bardolph, setting a dish of apples before him. The leather-coats’ belong doubtless to the russets; and perhaps, as Dr. Bull suggests, the *royal russet*, which still grows in Gloucestershire, is the apple of Shakespeare’s day.

Dr. Bull is no doubt correct in believing that apples and pears were cultivated in England long before cider and perry were made. The ancient Britons drank mead, our English forefathers ale. Wine was introduced by the Romans, and a great impetus was given to the wine trade by the Norman Conquest. William I. and his followers from Bordeaux and the neighbouring provinces introduced into England large

* Luke i. 15.

† Pt. I. p. 16.

‡ Judg. xiii. 7.

§ 1 Hen. IV. iii. 3.

|| 2 Hen. IV. ii. 4.

quantities of wine. ‘ The vine itself, which had been introduced
 ‘ by the Romans, was again carefully planted, and every effort
 ‘ was made by the Normans to establish it here. This is proved
 ‘ by the fact that there are no less than thirty-eight entries of
 ‘ vineyards in Domesday Book.’ Later on, when Henry II.,
 by his marriage with the daughter of William Duke of Aquitaine,
 obtained possession of Guienne, Poitou, Saintogne, Auvergne,
 &c., and was master, in the right of his father and mother, of Anjou,
 Touraine, Normandy, and Maine besides, the consumption of wine
 increased till at last the demand was greater than the supply.
 The price of wine was fixed by enactment in the reign of Edward
 III. (1396); ‘ the demand increased and the price got higher
 until the middle of the fifteenth century, when no wine was
 permitted to exceed the price of twelve pence the gallon, and a law
 was made that “ no person, except those who could spend a hundred
 marks annually, or were of noble birth, should keep in his house
 any vessel of wine exceeding ten gallons.” ’ Although, as we have
 seen, there is evidence to show that cider was used in Early English
 times (thirteenth century), it is probable that it did not come
 extensively into use till considerably later. So long as the French
 wines were available for consumption, our forefathers generally were
 content with wine and ale; but—when England lost the French
 provinces and frequent wars arose between the two countries,
 culminating in bitterness and hatred between the people, as they
 did in the reigns of William III. and Anne, all commerce was
 necessarily restricted, and every effort was made to supply the
 place of the French wines. The manufacture of home-made wine
 of every kind was encouraged, and then it was, too, that the
 production of cider was pushed forward, its use generally
 inculcated, and its praises vaunted to the utmost by our poets.’

It was in the time of William III. that John Philips, the
 mimetic Milton, published his principal poem, on ‘ Cider,’ in
 two books (1706), in verse which is but an echo of the numbers
 of ‘ Paradise Lost.’ There was nothing like cider:—

‘ What should we wish for more? or why in quest
 Of foreign vintage, insincere and mixt,
 Traverse th’ extremest world? Why tempt the rage
 Of the rough ocean, when our native glebe
 Imparts, from bounteous womb, annual recruits
 Of wine delectable, that far surmounts
 Gallie or Latin grapes, or those that see
 The setting sun near Calpe’s “ towering height ” ?
 Nor let the Rhodian nor the Lesbian vines
 Vaunt their rich must, nor let Tokay contend
 For sov’ranty: Phanæus self must bow
 To th’ Ariconian vales.’

The orchards of Herefordshire did not probably exist at the end of the thirteenth century, or some notice would have appeared of them or of their cider in Bishop Swinfield's Roll; but at the end of the sixteenth century 'we have the very positive evidence of old Gerarde, not only of the existence of orchards in the fields, and apple-trees in the hedgerows, but that cider was abundantly made and appreciated.' Gerarde speaks of apple-trees 'whose stocke or kindred is so infinite' that he thinks it 'not amisse to give one generall description.' He thus quaintly writes:—

'The tame and graffed apple trees are planted and set in gardens and orchards made for that purpose; they delight to grow in good and fertile grounds: Kent doth abound with apples of most sorts. But I have seen in the pastures and hedgerows around the grounds of a worshipful gentleman dwelling two miles from Hereford, called Master Roger Bodnorne, so many trees of all sorts, that the servants drinke for the most part no other drinke but that which is made of apples. The quantity is such, that by the report of the gentleman himselfe, the parson hath for tithie many hogsheads of syder. The hogs are fed with the fallings of them, which are so many, that they make choice of those apples they do eat, who will not taste of any but the best. An example doubtles to be followed of gentlemen that have land and living; but envie saith, the poore wil break down our hedges, and we shall have the least part of the fruit, but forward in the name of God, graffe, set, plant and nourish up trees in every corner of your grounds; the labour is small, the cost is nothing, the commoditie is great, yourselves shall have plenty, the poore shall have somewhat in time of want to relieve their necessitie, and God shall reward your good mindes and diligence.' *

Dr. Bull concludes his interesting essay on the 'Early History of the Apple and Pear' by a dissertation on the health-giving properties of 'syder' from the pen of the Rev. Martin Johnson, M.A., of Balliol College, Oxford, Vicar of Dilwyn from 1651 to 1698. Cider-drinkers are supposed to enjoy longevity,† which is said to be a characteristic of the county of Herefordshire, a fact 'happily borne out in these days by the evidence of the returns of the Registrar-General, which make Herefordshire one of the four longest-lived counties.' The Vicar of Dilwyn says:—

'This parish, wherein syder is plentiful, hath, and doth afford many people that have and do enjoy this blessing of long life: neither are the aged here bedridden or decrepit as elsewhere, but for the most part lively and vigorous; next to God, we ascribe it to our flourishing

* 'Herball,' p. 1459.

† John Philips, the cider poet, seems to have been an exception to this rule of longevity, for he died at the early age of thirty-two.

orchards, which are not onely the ornament but pride of our country, and that in a double respect, 1st, that the bloomed trees in Spring do not onely sweeten but purify y^e ambient air, as Mr. Beal observes in "Heref. Orchards," p. 8. Next, that they yield us plenty of rich and winy liquors, w^{ch} long experience hath taught do conduce very much to the constant health and long lives of our inhabitants, the cottagers, as well as y^e wealthier, using, for the most part, little other liquors in their families, than restorative sider. Their ordinary course among their serv^{ts} is to breakfast and sup with toast and cyder through the whole Lent, and the same dyet in the neighbourhood continues on fasting dayes all the yeere after; which heightens their appetites and creates in them durable strength to labour. Syder is their physick, and our vessels their apothecaries shops.'

With regard to the parentage of the apple some doubt exists among botanists whether besides *Pyrus malus*, Linn., two or three other closely allied wild forms, such as *P. acerba* and *P. præcox* or *paradisaica*, do not deserve to be regarded as distinct species. The latter is supposed by some authors to be the parent of the dwarf paradise stock now so generally used for grafting. Probably these forms are mere varieties, and it is certain that the common wild crab varies considerably in this country.* *Pyrus malus* is widely spread over Europe and

* Helm ('Kulturpflanzen und Hausthiere,' p. 458, Berlin, 1877) is of opinion that the cultivated apple was originally brought into Europe from Asia. We think this improbable; though the apple-tree (*Pyrus malus*) is indigenous in Western Asia, it does not appear to be so in India, whence our early Aryan ancestors migrated westerly into other countries. The apple was, we think, quite unknown to the people of India in ancient times: the general climate is not suited to it; though, perhaps, there are some parts of the Himâlayas where it would thrive, just as the peach, apricot, and walnut trees do now. The derivation of the word *apple*, which appears in Celtic, Slavonic, German, &c., still awaits satisfactory explanation at the hands of learned philologists. There does not appear to be any certain or even probable derivation of the word in Sanskrit. Dr. Karl Schönborn, indeed, in his exhaustive treatise, 'Etymologie von Obstnamen' (Breslau, 1866), refers 'apple' to a Sanskrit word *abala*; but no such word occurs in the dictionaries of Benfey and Monier Williams, and Prof. Max Müller writes to us that he has never met with the word. *Abala* = not + strong, or weak; but why such an epithet should be applied to an apple-tree or its fruit, one would be at a loss to conjecture. The learned Oxford professor once thought of the Sanskrit *āmra* (अम्र), 'the mango tree,' whose fruit is a kind of apple in appearance, but he is doubtful now. We believe that the Greeks and Romans were, historically speaking, the first cultivators of both apples and pears, and that England owes the introduction of both as cultivated fruits to the latter people, who found the original crab indigenous here with an already Celtic name (what-

Western Asia, and extends northwards into Scandinavia; it is probably a true native of our own country. The pear-tree (*Pyrus communis*, Linn.) occurs in the temperate regions of Europe and Asia, and extends northwards into southern Sweden; it is scattered over Britain, but has often escaped from cultivation, so that it is doubtful whether it is really indigenous. The more general opinion now is that all our varieties of apples have their origin in the single species, the *Pyrus malus*. But the cultivated fruit is a very different thing from the wild fruit, and the cultivated fruit depends upon a variety of circumstances, especially those relating to soil, which influence it in some way or other; and it is often difficult, if not impossible, to say beforehand what kind of soil will best suit some particular variety; experience alone will decide the question. The wild apple-tree will grow and thrive in almost every variety of soil, but even it is affected by local circumstances of soil and climate; and Knight's assertion that 'every variety of the apple is more or less affected by the nature of the soil it grows upon' has been amply confirmed by our experienced fruit-growers. 'On some soils the fruit attains a large size and is full of juice, on others it is dry and highly flavoured.' The peculiarities of soil adapted for the successful cultivation of our orchard cider apples are not necessarily best adapted for that of our dessert apples. Neither again are all the varieties of cider apples, though grown on the same soil, equally good for making the best kind of drink. Some fruits seem to receive benefit from those qualities in the soil by which others are injured, as would appear from the fact that excellent cider was formerly made from the *Redstreak*, *Golden Pippin*, and *Stire*, when grown in light soils. Most of our cider apples will only grow well and mature the desirable flavour of their juices on rich loam. According to Marshall 'the once celebrated *Stire*, which in the limestone lands of the Forest of Dean yielded an incomparably rich and highly flavoured cider, when grown in the rich deep soil of the Vale of Gloucester afforded a liquor only useful for its strength and roughness.' If we take the *Forwhelp*, the prince of

ever may be its root), which native Celtic name has survived to this day, and has not been superseded by the Latin *malum*. It is different with our word *pear*, which tree is not probably indigenous in a wild state in Britain. Pear is, of course, the Latin *pirus* or *pirum*, and it seems not improbable that the Romans, in this case, introduced both the tree and its name into this country, which Latin name it has ever since retained.

cider apples, which yields the cider so remarkable for its strength and *gusto*—its peculiar marked and delicious taste seems to linger on our palate as we write—if we transfer the Foxwhelp from the rich red loam of Herefordshire to a light sandy soil, the cider loses its merits and becomes thin and of very inferior flavour. The *Magloe Crab*, another celebrated apple in its day, is said to have required the calcareous rock called ‘Dunstone’ to bring out its full flavour and richness. It is certainly a curious fact, as the ‘*Pomona*’ tells us, and ‘more than an incidence, that the practical experience of so many generations of men should show that the two English counties which have chiefly given its high character to English cider, e.g. Herefordshire and Devonshire, are both remarkable for the same character of soil, that is for the deep clay loam of the old red sandstone.’ Light soils will not produce trees which yield superior cider, and experience fully confirms the rule that he who would plant a successful orchard must choose a deep stiff sandstone loam if he can do so. Lime seems to be an important ingredient in orchard soil. ‘Credenhill is noted for its orchards, and their fertility is due in great measure to the supply of lime from the marl or cornstone which surrounds the hill, as it does so many others in Herefordshire.’

We have already referred to Knight’s labours in the field of horticulture. He successfully studied the vegetable productions of the farm and garden, and even turned his mind to the improvement of some of our most useful domestic animals, as the breed of horses, cattle, sheep, pigs, and dogs. Nothing escaped his notice. The mode of growth of plants, the circulation of the sap in trees, the phenomena of germination, the influence of light upon foliage, the formation of roots, &c., ‘were all tested by a series of original and ingenious experiments.’ To the result of his labours we owe many new varieties of fruits, apples, pears, plums, nectarines, cherries, strawberries, currants; while the varieties of cabbages, peas, and onions improved under his guidance; new varieties of flowers were produced, and thus ‘he often made valuable and important additions to the luxuries and necessities of life.’

There is one theory, however, which Knight held, that unfortunately tended to operate against the progress of scientific horticulture for a long time, which we will notice, as the subject is most important from a practical point of view, and that is his belief that all varieties of apples and pears died out in time. In April 1795 Knight made a communication to the Royal Society in a paper called ‘Observations on the Grafting of Trees,’ in which he maintained that in the process of grafting

there was no renewal of vitality, but that the scion carried with it the debility of the tree from which it was taken. He repeated his opinion two years afterwards in his 'Treatise on the Culture of the Apple and Pear, and of the Manufacture of Cider and Perry.' The idea of varieties 'dying out' was not a new one, but it received at this time general acceptance on account of the well-known scientific and practical knowledge of its promulgator. 'It was so well put forward that the merit of an actual discovery was awarded to Mr. Knight by common consent.' Did not all fruit-growers recognise the difficulty of propagating by grafts from old and 'cankered' trees? Was not canker due to age and debility? Is it not therefore probable 'that there is a period beyond which the debility incident to old age cannot be stimulated'? It is fortunate that we are able to assert that Knight's theory is not correct. An individual tree may grow old and die, and the kind will of course die out if nothing is done to perpetuate it. But a tree is not an individual in the same sense that most animals are individuals; a tree is a collection of individuals, and every bud is potentially a new tree ready to grow under favourable conditions with renewed life and vigour, and to develop into a form like that which produced it.

As Dr. Bull has admirably said:—

'The notion that a graft can live no longer than the tree from which it is taken, seems to rest upon the assumption that the new wood which proceeds from the graft is not a new tree, but only a detached part of the parent. But this is evidently a mistake. A branch produced by a graft is as distinctly a new and separate individual as a branch produced by a cutting. In both cases the bud is the source of new growth; and, physiologically speaking, a seed itself differs little from a bud except in being more carefully protected, and in being spontaneously detached. The embryo in a seed, the bud inserted in budding, the buds in a graft or in a cutting, differ only in their position; and each, as it develops, becomes a new individual, not a mere dependent portion of the parent. The embryo of the seed doubtless gives that mysterious rejuvenescence of life which ever dwelt so strongly in Mr. Knight's mind; and there is this great difference, that whilst the bud necessarily produces the same plant from which it is derived, the seed, even when self-fertilised, is by no means always true to the plant producing it, and thus a new and varied species may be produced; but in each case the new plant has an independent existence, a distinct and separate life, inheriting, doubtless, much from the parent tree, but nevertheless capable of being largely influenced by the circumstances of its own position.'

The general opinion, however, of fruit-growers is that sorts do die out. 'Science may say what it likes,' said a very

intelligent horticulturist, whose hobby fruit-growing has been for many years; 'science may say what it likes, but it shall never make me believe that sorts don't die out, for I know they do.'

We have already mentioned the *Foxwhelp* as the best of all the orchard apples. This apple is an admirable instance to show the incorrectness of the 'dying-out theory;' which seems not only at variance with the general principles of vegetable physiology, but also contradicted by recent experiments. Of the *Foxwhelp*, Knight said more than sixty years ago: 'Some attempts are still made to propagate it, but I venture to predict they will not be successful; for the grafts necessarily partake of a life that is two centuries old, and the young stock can give nutriment only, not new life.'

In the last special notice to the members of the Woolhope Club we read the gratifying information that 'the Pomona Committee have the great satisfaction to inform the members that the experiments they have caused to be carried on during the last four years, for the restoration of those valuable orchard fruits, the *Foxwhelp*, *Sherme's Kernel* apples, and the *Taynton Squash Pear*, have completely succeeded. They have now 800 young trees in vigorous health.' Seedlings, i.e. apples and pears reared from pips, are of slow growth—at least it is long before they bear fruit. Apple-seedlings, according to Knight's experience, take from five to twelve years to come into bearing; pear-tree seedlings do not bear till they are twelve to eighteen years old, which reminds us of the lines of Virgil—

'Jam, quæ seminibus jactis se sustulit arbos,
'Tarda venit, seris factura nepotibus umbram.' *

Most curious also is the tendency to vary which apple-trees exhibit when grown from pips. Here are some experiments by Knight, who crossed certain kinds by pollen from other sorts. From the pips of the Orange Pippin fertilised by pollen from the Golden Pippin, he obtained these four varieties: the Grange Apple in 1802, the Downton Pippin in 1804, the Red Ingestrie in 1800, and the Yellow Ingestrie in the same year. From the pips of the Golden Pippin fertilised from the pollen of the Golden Harvey he obtained the Bingewood Pippin in 1800, and the Wormesly Pippin in 1811. Now the red and yellow Ingestries are very different apples, and yet, strange to say, they were not only derived from the same parentage, but actually sprang from two pips which occupied the same cell

* Georg. ii. 57.

in the same apple ! Yet the Yellow Ingestrie, whose colour resembles that of the Golden Pippin, ripens in October, whilst the Red Ingestrie, which is like the Golden Reinette, comes to maturity in November.

The third and fourth parts of the '*Herefordshire Pomona*' contain a valuable chapter on the surface, drainage, aspect, manuring, planting, grafting, budding, and pruning of orchard trees ; also some account of tree enemies, as the parasitic mistletoe, fungus growths, insect foes, &c. The question as to whether turf or tillage is best adapted for an orchard has been much discussed. In Herefordshire pasture orchards are the rule, and the same may be said of Devonshire ; but this arises rather from a matter of necessity, 'for the great convenience it affords for the ewes and lambs in spring, or the ordinary farm cattle at all seasons,' than from a conviction that turf orchards are the best. Physiologically speaking, one would suppose that the pasturage detracts from the trees by appropriating to itself the necessary moisture. Knight and most other Herefordshire authorities consider a hopyard as the most suitable place for a young orchard ; in Kent the orchard is cultivated as a hop-garden till the fruit-trees are large enough to yield a paying crop. The trees are said to profit by the cultivation and the protection given to the hops, to grow more freely, bear finer fruit, and to yield a longer-keeping cider. As the trees grow large, the hops must be uprooted and the field suffered to become permanent pasture. The American system of growing the roots in new orchards for the first five years and ploughing the soil between the trees deeply every year is probably that best suited to the requirements of the trees. As to drainage a due amount of moisture is absolutely necessary, but it must not be in excess ; above all, it must not be stagnant ; water long in contact with vegetable matter becomes impure by the formation of noxious gases, and is most injurious to the trees. 'An orchard in this condition is a miserable sight. The trees are rugged and stunted in growth, their boughs are weak, covered with lichen or moss, and can seldom produce much fruit ; and yet it is a sight by no means uncommon.' As to aspect we are told that any aspect tending westward is the proper one for an orchard, provided the locality is not apt to be swept by violent westerly gales. The popular idea of a south-east aspect being the best doubtless originates from the idea of the health-giving properties of the morning sun ; and this is quite true ; but the danger of a south-east aspect arises from the sudden exposure of the frozen blossoms in early spring to the heat of the rising

sun, which injures and often kills them ; with a western aspect the frozen blossoms are gradually thawed and suffer no detriment. This will sometimes account for what may not unfrequently be seen, one side of an orchard or of a tree bearing abundant fruit, the other being destitute of any. Such shelter as high quick hedges, woods, buildings, &c., afford, is serviceable to protect the trees from spring frosts and from high winds.

Manuring is of the highest consequence, though often grievously neglected ; on pasture land the orchard trees get only such manure droppings as fall from the cattle or sheep which graze beneath them. A careful farmer, it is said, now and then scatters a few ashes over the grass to improve the herbage, but he seldom thinks that ‘ the trees would be grateful for some better nourishment.’ In consequence of this want of manure the trees become exhausted from the heavy loads of fruit they bear ; and yet their ungrateful owners refuse to feed them !

Of course the kind of manure required must be determined by the consideration of the solid constituents of the tree and its fruit ; analysis will show the inorganic ingredients they demand from the soil. Professor Wolff, of Würtemberg, has made a very careful examination of the ingredients of the ashes of the trees, and the fruit both of the apple and the pear. Phosphoric acid is proved by analysis to enter largely into the composition of apples and pears, and as phosphorus is thought to be a good brain-food, such a fruit, like fish, is specially adapted to sedentary men who devote much time to hard study. Potash, lime, soda, and sulphuric acid must all be contained in good orchard soil. Farmyard manure by itself is not sufficient for the orchard ; it is deficient in phosphates and potash ; it is too stimulating, ‘ more likely to ‘ cause the production of weak succulent wood than of hard ‘ fruit-bearing spurs.’ A special orchard manure should be in readiness at every farm ; road scrapings, ditch and pond cleanings freely mixed with lime, ‘ must’ from the eider mill, are serviceable. The ‘ Pomona ’ recommends the following materials for orchard fertilisation, whether to encourage the vigorous growth of young trees or to restore the weak and exhausted state of those which have borne large crops of fruit :—

Bone-dust	1 part
Pure dissolved bone	1 „
Kainit *	2 parts
Charcoal-dust or fine coal-ashes	20 „

* We believe *Kainit* to be a name of cheap potash obtained from burning seaweed.

‘If these materials, carefully mixed, were lightly forked into the surface of the soil around trees, the amount required per acre would be something under a ton, and the cost be about two pounds—a moderate sum, when the value of the apple crop is considered.’

In planting it is desirable to select stout and well-grown trees from eight to ten years old. With regard to distance between them much depends upon the habit of growth according to the varieties, and on the space available. The distances between the trees should be from fifteen to forty feet; it is most important that each tree should have ample space to grow and expand, no one interfering with another in this respect. Overcrowding is injurious; large trees, as a rule, are more productive than small ones. Above all, and we lay very great stress on this point, *the trees must not be planted deeply in the soil*; the roots delight in good rich shallow soil where they can extend themselves laterally in every direction. In a large nursery-garden near Hereford which we recently visited, the young trees do literally little more than stand on their roots with a few inches of good soil and manure to cover them. Experience has fully justified a shallow system of planting, and one of the rules suggested by the Pomona Committee is, ‘that the roots be carefully spread out *immediately below the surface* and covered with fine soil, thus avoiding the error of ‘deep planting.’

Great care must be given to selection; the best varieties must be diligently sought after and cultivated. The quality of the cider and perry depends greatly upon the varieties of the fruit cultivated. With regard to cider we have seen how valuable is the old Foxwhelp apple in producing a drink of the best flavoured and most enduring qualities; many of the varieties of apples now to be seen in the orchards of Hereford may safely be dispensed with, and their place supplied by better proved kinds. ‘The present state of our orchards,’ says the ‘Pomona,’ ‘is most unsatisfactory in this respect, since they contain so large a proportion of varieties without name, character, or merit.’

A well-cared-for orchard should have a nursery for young trees in some out-of-the-way corner of the garden or field in which seedlings may be produced. Here young crab-stocks may be reared in the following simple manner. The squeezed pulp from the crab apples, called ‘must,’ after verjuice has been made, is placed in rows beneath the soil. This ‘must’ always contains a lot of apple-pips which have escaped crushing by the mill; these pips spring up, and in the course of four or six years, after a few careful transplantings, become

strong enough to graft with varieties of fruit of established merit. Or the pips may be separated from the 'must' by washing, so as to obtain clean seed; this should be mixed with moist sand or light mould, and set aside till February or March, then 'sown in drills an inch deep on a firm well-manured soil, 'made as for an onion-bed,' the pips thinly sown so as to allow the young plants a couple of inches apart. Some soon spring up, but the full crop generally requires a year in the ground before it appears; in the second year the seedlings will be ready to transplant into rows about a foot apart, and three or four inches from each other. After remaining here for two years, they will be ready to be transplanted into well-trenched ground, two spades deep and heavily manured, when, in horticultural language, they are said to be 'in quarters.' Here the rows should be two feet six inches apart, and each tree one foot apart. In the following August they will be ready for budding.

'Seedlings should always be transplanted early in autumn 'as soon as the leaf falls, and never later than the beginning 'of November.'

When the young seedlings are about three or four years old, they may be budded, a practice more general now than formerly, as 'it presents greater economy in material, in labour, and 'above all in time.' Should the buds fail, the young seedlings may be grafted, whereby the chance of blanks on the bed will be diminished. Whether budding or grafting be adopted, it should be done in the nursery where the growth of the scions may be regularly watched and well protected. Here they should remain till they have gained strength, and 'have got a 'good outline of head,' which rarely takes place till the stock is ten or twelve years old. If trees show a diminution of productive power, or are altogether unproductive, regrafting may be with advantage resorted to, even though they are of considerable age. The scions should be carefully grafted near the ends of the branches to ensure a more rapid production of fruit.

Pruning is another very important point in the cultivation both of the apple and pear; it is apt to be either wholly neglected or carried to excess. Both negligence and excess are to be condemned, but the latter seems to be more injurious than the former. In the one case the boughs grow matted together, and the fruit is small and poor in quality from want of light and air, 'or in the other whole boughs are mercilessly 'lopped off close to the trunk, leaving those great round scars, 'commonly called "owls' faces," to offend the eye of every

‘good orchardist, since he knows how deeply they injure the
‘trees and shorten their lives.’ As a rule, apple- and pear-
trees require very little pruning. As trees grow in very
different forms, some varieties being upright, some spreading,
some straggling, &c., the judicious pruner will notice the
peculiarities of each variety, and direct the operations of his
knife in conformity to these different modes of growth. Above
all, he must leave as much bearing wood as possible, for it
must be remembered that the whole tree derives its sap or life-
blood as much from the leaves and branches as from the
roots. The roots derive their nutriment from the soil, not,
however, directly. The sap must be elaborated in the leaves
by the action of light and air, before it is rendered physio-
logically capable of nourishing the whole arboreal system. It
follows, therefore, that, to ensure a good productive healthy
tree, the extent of root surface must be balanced by the extent
of foliage. Excessive pruning, or the merciless lopping off at
random of a lot of vigorous branches, is as disastrous to the
healthy growth of the tree and as debilitating to vegetable
life as the old system of phlebotomy is or was to that of the
human being. ‘Cutting off main branches should only be
‘required in young trees, and when this is properly done, no
‘leading branch should afterwards be touched, and the trees
‘should be left to live out the natural term of their lives and
‘fruitfulness.’

The enemies which attack apples and pears are numerous
and varied. The ravages of some are easily prevented by
a little trouble; those of others often defy the best efforts of
the cultivator. In severe weather hares and rabbits do
immense mischief by gnawing off the bark of the trees. Wire
netting is an efficacious check upon this evil, or surze may be
tied round the stems; a wash of lime and sulphur is advan-
tageous, but where these destructive rodentia abound, the only
effectual remedy is wire netting.

Everyone is familiar with the appearance of canker, ‘the
‘bane of most orchards.’ It is always indicative of some
direct mischief to the tree which results in a debilitated con-
dition, and a want of vitality. Doubtless canker arises from
various causes; old trees are very liable to it; the soil may
contain stagnant water, or it may be poor and deficient in
those ingredients which the variety of tree requires. Direct
external injuries to the bark may produce canker which, com-
mencing with enlargement of the vessels of the bark, continues
to increase until in the course of a few years the *alburnum* or

sapwood, the outer young wood which takes a principal part in the upward conveyance of the sap, dies; the bark cracks and rises in scales, and ultimately falls off. The best remedy for canker, whatever be the cause which produces it, is a good supply of suitable manure to the affected trees.

The disease popularly known as 'American blight'—though some of our Transatlantic friends indignantly repel the idea of its having been introduced from America—is caused by the devastations of one of the numerous species of *Aphides*, the most troublesome and destructive pests to various trees and plants that exist. The species which is so injurious to apple-trees is the *Schizoncura* (*Aphis*) *lanigera*, the specific name referring to the quantity of white cottony tufts which covers these insects. *Lanigera* attacks the young foliage and the bark of the trees; it inserts its sucking tube into the softer parts of the bark, and feeds on the sap. These insects often live in dense companies, and occasion, by the incessant pricking of their beaks, spongy or wart-like swellings on the stems. The trees thus injured produce stunted leaves and fruit, and often die. This *Aphis* is very tenacious of life, and thrives in cold winter weather, when the thermometer is as low as 21° Fahr. It is said in America to enter the ground and attack even the roots. In this country the apple-tree is often infested close to the ground, though the pest has not been observed to attack the roots. In the trees of an ordinary-sized garden the insects can be destroyed by washes of a mixture of petroleum and soft soap: an ounce of petroleum and half a pound of soft soap boiled gradually in a gallon of water, and applied with a brush or syringe where the white cottony little creatures show themselves. In orchards covering many acres most of the numerous receipts prove inefficient unless carefully and frequently applied; but the evil is of so destructive a nature that all efforts, notwithstanding the expense of labour they entail, should be persistently maintained to keep the insect pests down by repeated washings. Mr. Buckton, our most learned authority on the British aphides, remarks that 'in a garden much may be done by encouraging their natural enemies, *Coccinella*, *Syrphus*, and *Hemerobius*, and even by intentionally introducing insects already infested by hymenopterous parasites.' Mr. Buckton recommends, among purgative washes, a solution of calcium sulphide, soapsuds, solution of wood-ashes, coarse petroleum, kreosote, and tobacco-water made by infusing one pound of the leaf in four gallons of hot water. He adds, however, that

‘ a single heavy thunder-shower will do far more execution than the best efforts of the orchard-keeper.’ *

Amongst vegetable parasites, which in time will destroy the most vigorous apple-tree, must be mentioned ‘ the baleful mistletoe,’ as Shakespeare truly terms it. If the young mistletoe-seedling be carefully destroyed whenever it appears, the tree will be preserved; but when the parasite has succeeded in getting a firm hold of the branches, remedy is out of the question.

Certain forms of fungus growths are always very unwelcome guests in an orchard, whether as indicative of incipient decay or as being themselves the origin of some serious mischief. The larger kinds, such as *Polyporus hispidus* or *Pholiota squarrosus*, curious and often beautiful in themselves, are rather, at their first appearance, the consequence than the cause of evil. Such fungoid growths require a nidus in which decay has already commenced. Many insects attack apples and pears, which we need not enumerate. Our own experience is that little if anything can be done to remedy their injuries; birds and certain predaceous insects are of some service, but nature has provided the most effectual check to plant-destroyers in the shape of the parasitic hymenoptera. Mildew, a microscopic *oidium*, often attacks the young leaves and shoots of the trees; whitewashing the trunks with a handful of soot ‘ to sober down the colour,’ and another handful of sulphur to be exhaled by the sun during the heat of summer, may be of some service in checking such fungus blights.

The fourth part of the ‘ Pomona ’ contains some good practical remarks on fruit management, which, however, we have not space to notice, and also an extremely able essay on that most important and interesting question, the theory of fermentation. The writer, the Rev. Charles Henry Bulmer, is evidently well acquainted with the invaluable researches of the distinguished French scientist, M. Pasteur, the important results at which he has arrived, and the bearing which they have on the manufacture of cider, perry, &c.; but space forbids more than to mention the value of the remarks in the ‘ Pomona.’ On the question of ‘ orchard prospects ’ the ‘ Pomona ’ well says:—

‘ English agriculturists have now to meet the competition of the world, and it is desirable, on every account, that they should enlarge their sphere of action. Instead of confining themselves to corn and cattle, as they have hitherto done, they should pay closer attention to

* A monograph of the ‘ British Aphides,’ vol. iii. p. 94. Ray Society, 1881.

the growth of other products which will command a constant and lucrative market in our own populous and wealthy towns. . . . Happy in these times are they who, living in districts specially adapted for the growth of hardy fruits, can turn their efforts in this direction. Our orchards ought to supply, economically and profitably, the markets of our towns and cities with an abundance of apples and pears, and be able to meet there, moreover, an active competition from America, from the Continent of Europe, and even from Australia. It is true that the rent of land is dearer, and the fruit seasons much more uncertain, in England; but these disadvantages are almost balanced by the greater expense of labour (at least in America, our greatest rival), by the increased expense of packing, the cost of carriage, the liability to injury, and by the still more serious item of profit to the middlemen, or importers. The importation of fruit must always be more difficult than that of grain, and the cost greater. . . . There is every reason, therefore, to believe that steady perseverance in orchard culture will meet with a successful reward.'

With respect to our competition with America, we would recommend the Pomona Committee to turn their attention to the raising and cultivation of some keeping dessert apple which, by its peculiar excellence, may hope some day to rival that most delicious of all apples, the Newtown Pippin.* The profits from the sale of these American apples, one would think, must be great in favourable seasons. Our own summers are not hot enough for the Newtown Pippin, 'the glory of the orchards of 'New York,' and England cannot hope to cultivate the fruit. Perhaps the old Ribston Pippin, sometimes called the 'glory of York,' is about the best substitute for the American fruit; it is in perfection in November and December, and with good management will even keep till March. The history of this apple will be found in Part IV. of the 'Pomona.' Some years ago it was confidently asserted that this favourite variety was dying out. We are glad to hear that in Messrs. Richard Smith & Co.'s celebrated nursery near Worcester, '3,000 plants of the Ribston Pippin are annually propagated by budding for trained plants, pyramids, and standards.'

A suggestion well worthy of consideration is given in the 'Pomona,' that the theory and practice of horticulture and fruit-growing might be introduced with advantage as a science subject into our country elementary schools, as was most successfully done many years ago by the late Professor Henslow in his village school in Cambridgeshire. In these

* Cox's Orange Pippin (part iii.), said to be a seedling from the Ribston Pippin, is perhaps the best modern addition to the dessert-table, but handsome as it is in shape and colour, its excellence in flavour leaves something yet to be desired.

respects English schools are far behind those on the Continent, where elementary instruction in horticulture is aided by manual work in the garden. The 'Herefordshire Pomona' has itself done good work amongst our fruit-growers; interest is more than ever excited, additional land is taken in and filled with hundreds of young trees of different varieties of apples and pears in some of our nursery gardens; a scientific spirit walks hand in hand with practical and experimental knowledge. Continual progress in the art of fruit cultivation cannot fail to be made, as this really splendid and valuable work becomes wider known.

'Quid quæque ferat regio' was an old Latin adage in the days of Columella and the writers on Roman agriculture. Special fruits require special soil. The greatest attention, therefore, must be paid to the special products of every district.

'Great competition must be met by high cultivation, by economy, and by intelligent, persevering industry. The land must be managed, if not in the letter, yet in the economic spirit, of John Stuart Mill, who pointed as an illustration to the cabbage of the French proprietor, so carefully dug round, watered, and manured; so individualised, in short, as though the whole profit of the farm centred in that one single vegetable. By thus paying greater attention to minute details, the farm may become, what it ought to be, in these days of competitive agriculture in both hemispheres, a duplicate of the garden on a large scale.'

We believe that the Royal Agricultural Society is advocating the claims of fruit-farming. This is a step in the right direction, and we look forward with hopeful prospects to the time when fruit-farming shall become more general than it is at present.

Information with regard to the most desirable kinds of apples and pears, for kitchen, dessert, cider and perry purposes, recommended to those who are thinking of forming orchards or introducing varieties into their garden, will be found in the 'Herefordshire Pomona,' and in Dr. Hogg's very valuable and practical 'Fruit Manual,'* a new edition of which is being reprinted, as well as in the catalogues published by the nursery gardeners throughout the country, and to such sources of information our readers must be referred.

* 'Fruit Manual, containing Descriptions, Synonyms, and Classification of the Fruits and Fruit-trees of Great Britain, with 101 engravings of the best varieties.' By Robt. Hogg, LL.D., F.L.S. London, 1875. Dr. Hogg describes about 478 apples and 587 pears.

- ART. VII.—1. *Schubert*. By Sir GEORGE GROVE, D.C.L., Director of the Royal College of Music. ‘Dictionary of Music and Musicians,’ vol. iii. London: 1882.
2. *Life of Chopin*. By FRANZ LISZT. Translated from the French by M. WALKER COOK. London: 1877.
3. *F. Chopin; his Life, Letters, and Works*. By MORITZ KARASOWSKI. Translated from the German by EMILY HILL. London: 1879.
4. *Franz Liszt*. By L. RAMANN. Translated from the German by Miss E. COWDERY. London: 1882.

IT is not with any idea either of bringing out supposed analogies in their genius and character, or of planting them, like three Horatii, to defend the passage to any special theory of musical art, that we have linked together in the heading of this article the names of musicians so diverse in their social and artistic character as Schubert, Chopin, and Liszt. The two latter had, it is true, some artistic leanings in common, besides being closely connected in personal friendship; but this consideration only removes them more decidedly from the neighbourhood of Schubert. It is necessary, therefore, to make it clear at the outset that the juxtaposition of the three names here is suggested mainly by the recent publication or translation of certain biographies and other literary notices of these composers. It may be added, however, as a rider to this practical excuse, that if the subjects of this article have not so many affinities as to warrant us in grouping them together, they are at least ‘full of most excellent differences,’ which in their very sharpness of contrast are not only picturesque, but in certain senses instructive.

In our estimate of the few artistic creators of the very highest order, the great poets or ‘makers’ in verse and drama, in painting, sculpture and music, we are content to accept their creations as the all-important fact of their lives, and as subjects for study and elucidation rather than for criticism in the more bounded sense of the word. Their lives and characters are of interest because they produced such great works; we feel that all information connected with them shares the interest reflected from their artistic greatness, but the latter is the predominant fact after all, and minor details as to their lives do not much affect our judgment of them or of their works. And in most cases their art seems to have been to themselves also the one absorbing interest of life. Once in an age the world may

see such a sublime unconsciousness as that of Shakespeare, or such an almost equally sublime self-consciousness as that of Michel Angelo, throwing off with indifference productions which were to be the admiration of the world, in the spirit characterised by Browning:

‘ Shall I be judged by only these ? ’

But these two instances stand almost alone. The great artists are mostly judged by themselves and by the world as artists. Titian was essentially a great painter, Beethoven essentially a great musician; and so supreme is their art over every other consideration, that, if the very different private characters and lives of Titian and Beethoven could be transposed, their works remaining the same, our feeling as to their respective productions would hardly be affected in any way. It is otherwise when we come to the second rank of creative artists. In their company many questionings are suggested which are silenced under the supremacy of the *Di majores*. We are conscious of limits to their powers, discrepancies between their aims and their attainments; we begin to consider the why and wherefore of these, and feel at liberty to distinguish and select, to take what seems successful in their productions, and pass more lightly over the rest. With the diminution of scale in artistic power, moreover, the personality of the artist becomes a more prominent factor in our estimate of him, and we feel at liberty to weigh in the balance the comparative value of personal and artistic character. In one instance, indeed, a biographer even of one of the greatest of painters has had the courage to ask whether, if a man had the choice of being as great a painter as Turner, with Turner's education and manners, or a generally educated and courteous gentleman of only average capacity, the latter would not be by far the preferable lot.* Artistic and social questions of this kind are certainly suggested, though not with quite the same emphasis, in comparing the three musical biographies before us.

The article on Schubert in the ‘ Dictionary of Music and Musicians,’ by the editor, constitutes the most graphic account of the composer which we have in our language as yet, though, as a dictionary article, it gives a most disproportionate prominence to Schubert in comparison with the brief space accorded to some much greater composers. Sir G. Grove (like so many less able writers on music) is an enthusiast, and is apt

* Mr. P. G. Hamerton, in some papers on Turner published in the ‘ Portfolio.’

to get so far carried away by a congenial subject as to give it, for the moment, an exaggerated value. We adverted to this in regard to the article on Mendelssohn; but that on Schubert is still more open to the same charge, and there are special reasons why we cannot feel surprised that this is so. For it was owing to the enterprise of the editor of this dictionary, and his idea that Schubert's unknown compositions would probably have a value proportionate to that of his known ones, that the MS. scores of the symphonies were disinterred from their burial-ground in a dusty cupboard at Vienna, and in due time performed at the Crystal Palace concerts, for which the fortunate discoverer of the Schubert MSS. has for so many years furnished the literary illustrations which have given a special popular interest to the Crystal Palace concert programmes. It is perfectly natural that an eloquent writer on music should feel a great kindness for the composer whom he had thus been the means of making better known to the world, and that his interest in Schubert should expand itself into somewhat overstrained expressions of admiration. But the admission of all that Sir G. Grove claims for Schubert as a composer would be tantamount to lowering very much the standard and requirements of instrumental music of the highest class; and, without grudging the editor his private pleasure and satisfaction in Schubert's symphonies and sonatas, and in the contemplation of Schubert generally, we must candidly aver not only that we do not share this enthusiasm to anything like the same extent, but that we think it desirable, in the interests of a true musical criticism, that musical readers generally should not share it, or at least that they should be admonished to think twice before doing so, for reasons which we will endeavour to show.

For estimating the character and acquirements of Schubert Sir G. Grove has given us adequate materials in his article; and a very pathetic story it is. Artistically, Schubert comes before us in it as almost the typical example of the self-taught genius, with the reservation, however, that he did not teach himself enough. There could hardly be, in one sense, a more direct practical negative than he furnishes to the famous definition of genius as 'an infinite capacity for taking pains;' for his genius was unquestionable, if there is any meaning in the word at all, but taking pains would seem to have been as impossible to him as, up to a certain point, it was unnecessary. Yet what his career really exemplifies is, not that the aforesaid definition is false, but that it is only half the truth, and that genius without taking pains will

never achieve a grasp of the highest capabilities of art. Of spontaneous musical ability, or what is sometimes called musical inspiration, Schubert had an unusual share; and Sir G. Grove suggests that, had but a portion of the pains been bestowed upon his musical education which was lavished on that of Mozart and Mendelssohn, 'he would have gained that control over the prodigious spontaneity of his genius which is his only want, and have risen to the highest level in all departments of composition, as he did in song-writing.' To our thinking, his whole life contradicts any such supposition. He never would have worked. He did not want cautions from his friends as to his neglect of systematic study—cautions which seem to have been among the very few things that ever made him angry. He had spoken of entering on a serious course of study shortly before his death, but it may be doubted whether he ever would have carried out his intention had his life been spared. It was not in him to do so. He once stirred himself up to examine the manuscript score of *Fidelio* with a view of profiting by Beethoven's method of working out and maturing his ideas, but soon broke off impatiently with the remark that the music 'seemed just as good to him at first as at last, and that he could see no use in such drudgery.' His attitude towards the art was throughout his life that of a very gifted amateur, who wants art just as far as he can get enjoyment out of it, and turns away at the point where hard work comes in.

It was of course only a very exceptional gift of musical ear, feeling, and perception that could have enabled him, with such habits and temperament, to accomplish the beautiful music which he has left in his songs alone, which are and will always remain his highest and most indubitable titles to fame. The testimony as to his natural powers appears in the earliest records of his musical life. His first teacher, Michael Holzer, the choir-master of the suburban parish of Lichtenthal (Vienna), where he was born, remarked that when he wanted to teach the child anything fresh 'he always knew it already.' At eleven he was first soprano in the Lichtenthal choir, and a few months afterwards was sent to the Imperial school for training choristers for the Court Chapel, where he soon took a place in the band with pupils much older than himself, one of whom looked round one day to see who was playing so well behind him, and found it was 'a little fellow in spectacles named Franz Schubert.' The little boy in spectacles soon confided to his older friend that he had already composed a good deal—that he 'could not help it,' and would do it every day if he could afford to get music-paper; one of the first in-

dications of that sad spectre of poverty which dogged Schubert to his latest hour. His fellow-pupil (Spaun by name) managed that for him, and showed him other kindnesses. Schubert's home practice in string-playing had given him the start of the other pupils; for his father, though a man of humble origin, possessed musical as well as other abilities, and had taught his sons as far as he could. On his holidays from the school the great delight of the family was to play quartetts, when the youngest became sometimes the critic, and if his father made a mistake, or repeated it when once made, Franz would say timidly, 'Herr Vater, there must be something wrong here;' a mode of correction in accordance with the gentle disposition which he showed throughout his life.

How the composer supported himself when he left the school and his father's home it seems to have been impossible to discover; but enough leaks out in regard to various passages in his subsequent life to indicate pretty well what was the general tenor of it; and anything less interesting or eventful it would be hard to conceive. Indeed, Sir G. Grove affirms that 'no memoir of Schubert can ever be satisfactory, 'because no relation can be established between his life and 'his music; or rather because there is no life to establish a 'relation with. The one scale of the balance is absolutely 'empty, the other is full to overflowing.' For what little there is of connected biography to be told, and for the connected and historical account of his compositions, we may refer the reader to Sir G. Grove's pages. But we prefer, before saying a few words about his music, to put together some of the more salient traits showing what manner of man was Schubert, what manner of life he led, and what were his ideas about his art; for in a certain degree the very negativeness of the narrative has its own significance.

In regard to his ideas about his art, he seems to have had as nearly as possible none whatever; certainly his present biographer hardly helps us to any. The record is all but a blank. In answer to Hiller's question 'Do you write much?' he replied 'I compose every morning, and when one piece is done, I 'begin another.' He could have said literally, with Goethe's minstrel—

'Ich singe wie der Vogel singt,
Der in den Zweigen wohnet'—

though it would never have occurred to him to quote Goethe, or anyone else, in defence of his position, which was simply unconscious. Compositions once written were often never thought of again—'put away in a drawer and forgotten,' as

some one said of him. His biographer's description of him on this head may be quoted:—

‘The habit of writing to whatever words came in his way was one of Schubert's characteristics, especially in the earlier part of his career. With his incessant desire to sing, with an abundant fountain of melody and harmony always welling up in him and endeavouring to escape, no wonder that he grasped at any words and tried any forms that came in his way, and seemed to afford a channel for his thoughts. If good, well; if bad, well too. The reason why he wrote eight operas in one year was, no doubt, in great measure, because he happened to meet with eight librettos; had it been four or twelve instead of eight, the result would have been the same. The variety in the productions even of this early year is truly extraordinary.’

That the variety and quantity of work produced on that principle would be very great seems likely enough; but it is hardly the system from which one expects the production of works of a uniformly high class, even from a man of genius. Of the relative literary value of the words which he set to music he seems to have had no perception whatever.

‘He seems to have been hardly able, at any rate he did not care, to discriminate between the magnificent songs of Goethe, Schiller, and Mayrhofer, the feeble domesticities of Kosegarten and Hölty, and the turgid couplets of the authors of his librettos. All came alike to his omnivorous appetite.’

Is this an intellectual use of the art of music? The same charge has been brought against Rossini, and made a heavy item of accusation against him by critics of the modern school; surely what is sauce for Peter is sauce for Paul, or should be so. The matter is not mended, for our general estimate of Schubert, when we turn to what is recorded of his social habits and character. The virtue of humility he certainly possessed to a high degree; whether it be the most valuable virtue for an artist may be a question. We might name more than one man of artistic genius in one or another art whose wings have been clipped, and his career rendered a partial failure, by a want of belief in his own powers; and to describe Schubert as ‘the only great composer who did not think himself ‘the greatest man in the world’ is to imply what is very unjust to Bach, Haydn, Mozart, and Mendelssohn, none of whom could fairly be called vain or egotistical. Certainly his modesty was a remarkable contrast to the regal pride of Beethoven, but the contrast between their powers is pretty well commensurate. Is it sinful to suggest that, after all, humility is a somewhat *bourgeois* virtue? The theory at least fits Schubert, who was *bourgeois* to the backbone. The

biographer's candid admissions about his idol in this respect are calculated to edify a cynical reader. 'He was a true Viennese, born in the lowest ranks, . . . loving the society of his own class, shrinking from praise or notice of any kind.' When he was engaged as teacher of music, in the family of Count Johann Esterhazy, and passed the summer at their country seat at Zelész, 'he is evidently more at home in the servants'-hall than the drawing-room. "The cook is a pleasant fellow, the ladies' maid is thirty, the housemaid very pretty, and often pays me a visit;"' and so on, in his own words. But this was not to be wondered at when we consider the style of society he loved, and quitted with regret for the decorous household of the Count. When he lived with his friend Mayrhofer, Schubert was nicknamed 'Kanevas,' because when a stranger came into their circle his first question always was, 'Kann er was?' 'Can he do anything?' Their amusements consisted of 'sham fights, howls, rough jokes, and repartees.' At another period of his life he seems to have pigged together in a kind of happy-family fashion with two other congenial spirits, one of whom he called, with vulgar effusiveness, 'seine Geliebte' (using the feminine termination); they had nominally their own lodgings, but often slept together in the room of one, and had common property in hats, boots, coats, and cravats. Speaking generally, his biographer says elsewhere:—

'He was a born *bourgeois*, never really at his ease except among his equals and chosen associates. With them he was genial and compliant. At the dances of his friends he would extemporise the most lovely waltzes for hours together, or accompany song after song. He was even boisterous—playing the "Erl King" on a comb, fencing, howling, and making many practical jokes. But in good society he was shy and silent, his face grave,' &c.

The story of his running out of the house when, at an interview with Beethoven, the great man called attention to a fault in one of Schubert's compositions, is an example really of *gaucherie* of the same kind, rather than of any higher feeling. The biographer comments on it with what we must call the rather foolish question, 'Which of us would not have done the same?' No man with proper self-respect would have done so; but self-respect is a flower that does not flourish in so coarse a soil as that in which Schubert was content to imbed himself.

All this goes far to suggest a repetition of Mr. Hamerton's query in regard to Turner; but without entering on that question, we may ask, is there no relation traceable between the

style of Schubert's life and the style of his art? The possibility of such a relation we heard incidentally suggested once by the remark of a dignified and gentle-mannered old lady, after hearing a sonata of Schubert's, that there was something in his music which always gave her the idea that he was not a refined man. The speaker, we ascertained, knew nothing of the composer's history; it might have been a happy hit, or a real instance of keen insight. That there is something radically wanting in Schubert's art is a conclusion to which on one account we must almost desire to come; for if we were to accept it as deserving all that is claimed for it by the creed of Sydenham, we must be forced to the conclusion that an art in which the best or nearly so can be produced, as Schubert's music seems to have been produced, without thought or care for its meaning, or for the value of the words, without what can be called intellectual perception, by a mere spontaneous process of letting composition run through to the end of the composer's pen, is an art of less intellectual value than we have supposed or would wish to suppose it. Now, one limitation of Schubert's art seems to be implied in that very sentence, in a letter of Liszt's, which has been often quoted, that Schubert was 'the most poetic of all composers:' a sentence on which too much stress has been laid as the offhand epistolary expression of a man who was not of a very calm or well-balanced judgment, and the real meaning of which it would be difficult to define. Had Liszt said 'the most romantic of all composers,' he would have come nearer to the truth, and perhaps to his own actual meaning. Schubert is more essentially of the romantic school than any other composer of at all the same calibre; and the romantic school means the school of fluent and passionate expression with deficient formative or shaping power. In all forms of art, it represents essentially the *dilettante* side of artistic production and expression: the type of art whose productions appeal often the most strongly to the emotions in the first instance, but, leaving little for the intellect, are liable to lose in effect in proportion as they become familiar. Schubert, as a musician, had (apparently through instinct rather than study) sufficient constructive power to handle successfully the simple and limited form of song-writing; and the majority of his best songs, as far as they go, are very perfect and finished in form. But beyond the limits of the song form he never seems to have had or to have taken any pains to acquire the power of marshalling his materials into a finished and proportioned structure, co-ordinate in all its parts, as is the case with the more extended works of com-

posers of the first order. Confining ourselves to the songs for the moment, it must also be said that, with a few brilliant exceptions, their very romanticism moves within rather narrow bounds, difficult to define in words, but not the less to be felt. It is the romanticism of that somewhat heavy, melancholy, semi-mystical type, which was peculiar to the Germany of a generation or two back, which would gaze with sentimental tears at the splendours of sunset, and sing passionate serenades to *die Treue*, with its long hair blowing wildly in the evening breeze, and then indulge itself with an orgy of beer and tobacco; which could be amused with schoolboy pranks, and was as innocent of soap and water as of many other niceties of civilisation.* The most favourable musical expression of this romanticism is to be found in Schubert's songs, and occasionally he rose quite above it, as in his noble 'Ave Maria,' a hymn for a solo voice which seems to have arisen out of a moment of genuine spiritual aspiration, and which is so clear of any special German mannerism of feeling and style that it might almost as well pass for Italian as German; it combines, in fact, the best qualities of both schools. But, taking Schubert's songs *en masse*, while we admit that he almost made the modern German song, or at least raised it to the level of an artistic creation, and that he wrote a larger number of beautiful songs than any other modern composer, we must still find that, even in this class of productions, he rarely reached the highest range of feeling. Poor Schubert had no touch of the heroic or chivalresque about him, and the heroic note is not in his songs. A long morning with them, even with a singer capable of fully entering into their meaning, leaves one (we speak from experiment) with a consciousness of having been overdosed with sentiment; of having gone through a great deal of repetition and mannerism, beautiful at first but cloying after a time; with a longing for something more bracing and manly in style and feeling. Many of Schubert's love songs are exquisite, in a sense; but they represent either merely rustic love, or that sad and clinging sentiment which belongs to the weaker and not to the nobler side of the passion. His songs, artistically, are much more equably rounded and finished than Schumann's, but he never rose to so fine and chivalrous a feeling as is expressed, for instance, in one or two of the 'Spanish love songs' of the latter composer, or in some of the 'Franen-

* Schubert used to sleep in his spectacles, that he might be ready to compose the moment he awoke, either in bed or out of it. The inference as to the toilet is pretty obvious.

‘*liebe*’ and ‘*Dichterliebe*’ series.* Of the peculiar beauty and significance of Schubert’s accompaniments too much can hardly be said; they both support the voice and illustrate the poem; and in the best examples the voice part and accompaniment blend completely into one artistic whole, and neither can be thought of apart from the other. This is perfect art in its class, but it is not the highest class, and does not in itself avail to place its author on the pedestal occupied by the few great musicians of the world, or to justify such extravagant expressions as his biographer indulges in, speaking of the concert where the ‘*Erl King*’ was first publicly sung: ‘Think what the first appearance of these godlike pieces must have been! It was the rising of the sun! He is now an everyday sight to us; but how was it the first time that he burst in all his brightness on the eyes of mortals?’ This would be rather bombastic even if spoken in reference to the greatest works of Beethoven; but when indulged in *apropos* of a song of which, except in country parishes, people are now almost as tired as they are of the songs in ‘*Der Freischütz*’ (which belong to the same school of German romanticism), it is really absurd.

That Schubert would, nevertheless, have been counted among the greatest composers had his larger works been of the same relative excellence and completeness as his songs, is hardly to be questioned. To have spoken of his symphonies and sonatas in the same breath with those of the really great instrumental composers would have seemed, however, twenty years ago, an absurdity. Of late years they have been diligently written up by certain musical critics; and, as a large proportion of concert-goers will believe anything that is said in the press, if it is only said often enough and strongly enough, the idolisers of Schubert have no doubt found a fair number of proselytes. The belief in Schubert’s greatness as an instrumental composer is, however, a forced one; and the more the public learn about musical composition and musical form, the more certainly they will eventually find this out. In fact, the relation between Schubert’s character and his music is illustrated more strongly in regard to his instrumental composition than in the other branch of his art. It is the work of a man who would write copiously as the whim

* It is noticeable that the two love songs by Schubert which are the most manly and healthy in tone are both inspired by Shakespeare’s words, viz. ‘Hark the lark!’ and ‘Who is Sylvia?’ and it is remarkable how very English they are in spirit, the latter especially.

seized him, but would take no trouble about it. It is urged by his biographer that Schubert was not an indolent man; the amount of his compositions, and the known fact that he was so constantly writing, being cited in his favour. But this industry was not of the right breed. The industry which consists in doing a great quantity of work carelessly, and in the way that is most agreeable to the worker, is only another form of indolence. Beethoven, as his note-books show, would expend more study and pains in rendering a single theme what he thought it ought to be than Schubert probably ever bestowed on a whole movement. The symphonies and sonatas of the latter are full of beautiful melodies, which succeed each other sometimes in almost lavish profusion, but of which, beyond their presentation to the ear, nothing is made. In his shorter pieces, which hardly go beyond the song form, the music is often not only lovely in itself, but complete in form, as in such a little gem as the well-known 'Moment Musical' in F minor, which is absolutely perfect; and one or two others of the same set are hardly less so. But in an extended musical composition in the sonata form something more than beautiful melodies is demanded. A grasp of the whole materials as subordinate to one complete design must be evident; the constituent elements of the composition must be linked together as parts of an organic whole, presented in new and varied combinations, so as to bring out all their latent expressiveness as well as their harmonic or contrapuntal relationship; a method of handling which demands a constructive power such as Schubert never even sought to acquire. The result of such co-ordination of materials is not to create, but to preclude monotony; to give to a long composition, though founded on a limited number of themes, a continually new and varied interest. The consequence of Schubert's lack of this power is that the shrewd criticism applied to him by Vogl the singer, on first hearing some of his songs—'You squander your fine thoughts instead of making the most of them'—is tenfold more applicable to his longer instrumental compositions. Lovely melodies follow each other, but nothing comes of them; or he repeats an idea without apparent aim or purpose beyond the wish to spin out the composition to a certain orthodox length. Thus, in the andante movement of the Symphony in C, the really beautiful leading theme is repeated and repeated with little variation till the repetition becomes almost irritating to the listener. Compare this with the variety of treatment and effect which Beethoven has concentrated on the subject of the allegretto in the Seventh Symphony, for example, and the

difference between the master-workman and the amateur is at once obvious. So important a composition as an orchestral symphony demands, also, that all the varied detail of the orchestral parts should have its own point and interest, its special reference to the main design. Sir G. Grove has himself pointed out how remarkably this condition is fulfilled by Beethoven, so that his symphonies, in their union of splendid total effect with multiplicity of carefully designed detail, seem almost like the products of nature rather than of art. But what is the value of this critical appreciation when we find the same admiration lavished on symphonies like those of Schubert, which have none of these characteristics; which are uninteresting and unpolished in their detail, and full of 'vain repetitions' introduced merely because the composer wished to go on, and had no better way of doing so? The same criticism applies to his pianoforte sonatas, with somewhat less force only because less is demanded of music written for this less elaborate medium of expression. Take as an example the sonata in G,* which Schumann cited as the most complete in form of all the composer's works; a citation quoted with apparent approval by his biographer. The first two movements are heavy and loaded in style; the Minuet is charming; the Trio especially is one of those magical little inspirations, like the music of a dream, which come from Schubert in his happiest moments; but this, again, shows us how the composer could only do his best in pieces on a small scale, and in a simple and concentrated form. The *finale* is one of the most typical examples of his melodic gift and his constructive weakness combined; the leading themes are charmingly melodious and spontaneous, but the different portions have no logical connexion with each other; they follow and repeat themselves categorically; the composition has no backbone; it is very pretty, though very diffuse writing; but instrumental composition of the highest class it is not, and no rhapsodising will make it so. The moral is that which nearly all Schubert's more extended instrumental compositions serve to point—that in music, as in literature, easy writing is hard reading. The

* This is the sonata which was misrepresented by the publisher (Haslinger) as if it were four different compositions—a Fantasia, Adagio, Minuet, and Allegretto. It is odd that this absurd mistake is kept up even in the English edition published under the direction of so competent a musician as Herr Pauer, where it appears in this form, and in the volume of miscellaneous compositions, instead of in its proper place among the complete sonatas. Blunders of this kind, once made, die hard.

materials for exquisite musical structures are there, but the will or the power to combine them into an effective whole is wanting; and even those of his longer compositions which are quite balanced and symmetrical in form almost always affect one as too long, owing to their loosely-knit structure and want of *verve* and finish of detail; as Garrick said of Adam Smith's conversation, they are 'flabby,' and therein reflect their author's whole life and character. Schubert's life and works, indeed, suggest a lesson almost as much moral as artistic—that the most strong and healthy form of art, as of character, is not to be developed by giving oneself up to emotional impulses, however beautiful and attractive; that the strong artist, as well as the strong man, is he who is the master, not the servant, of his fancy and inspiration.

To pass from Schubert to Chopin is to pass to the opposite pole of the social and artistic world; from the Bohemianism of the *cabaret* to the utmost refinement of the *salon*, from the reckless lavishing of musical ideas in careless profusion to the production of a comparatively small number of nearly perfect works, elaborated and polished down to the finest details. The catalogue of Schubert's compositions fills pages in the 'Dictionary of Music;' that of Chopin's is compressed into one brief paragraph.* But, while we ask, on the one hand, how much of Schubert's easily-produced work will retain a permanent place in the art, we may ask, on the other hand, how much of Chopin is there that we can spare? and the answer must be, Very little; perhaps a smaller proportion than in the case of some really greater composers. Like Schubert, Chopin showed his best and most complete power within rather narrow bounds; but, unlike Schubert, he knew this and acted up to his knowledge; and, instead of thoughtlessly flinging himself on the whole field of music, he developed and polished his special talent to the highest possible point; and the few thin volumes of pianoforte music which represent the principal part of his life's artistic work stand alone in their individuality of style, their combination of intensity of expression with the highest finish of detail. He was professedly and avowedly what Schubert also was in reality, a specialist in the art, cultivating a particular branch

* As if to emphasise the contrast, it may be observed that while Schubert is awarded his fifty pages and upwards of effusive adulation, Chopin—a higher figure both as man and artist—is allowed to be disposed of in a couple or so of ill-written and flippant columns, a discredit to the Dictionary, like nearly all the contributions of the same writer.

of it only with effect and success. Schubert was essentially a song-writer, Chopin essentially a pianoforte-writer. A composer who is great only in one branch of the art, and seems to have developed a faculty specially to that end, cannot ever take rank with those few great musical poets to whom every medium of expression comes alike, and who cannot but be great in whatever form and through whatever material means they make themselves heard. But there is often a peculiar interest attaching to the productions and the artistic style of these specialist composers. They exhibit to us in a more concentrated form the relation between feeling and means of expression in music; they present us with special developments of technique arising out of the special means of expression which they select; and in this latter respect no works in the whole range of music are more characteristic, more instructive, than those of Chopin, a born pianist (as it would almost seem) who developed, for the expression of his own peculiar artistic idiosyncrasy, a new manner and a new technique arising directly out of the character and capabilities of his chosen instrument, and such as could by no possibility belong to any other medium of musical expression. But, in addition to this special artistic interest, of which a word more presently, Chopin is one of the most interesting of all musicians in his social and personal aspect. He is almost the only one among the eminent composers who was in the best sense an aristocrat, not in mere pride or in the desire to be recognised by and to associate with 'great people' (which has been a foible of artists in all ages), but in that sense of personal dignity and self-respect which made him feel above rather than below his art, in that gentleness and refinement of manners and feeling which even among friends and in the most unrestrained intercourse always kept him within the limits of perfect good taste, so that, as his friend Liszt testifies, 'he never made use of an 'inelegant word, even in moments of the most entire familiarity. An improper merriment, a coarse jest, would have 'been shocking to him.' He showed that to be a true, even an 'intense,' musical poet of the romantic school, it was not necessary to trample upon all the *convenances* of refined society, and that the part of musical *virtuoso* and impassioned composer was compatible with that of a high-bred and polished gentleman and man of the world. As Liszt very truly puts it, Chopin, accustomed early to the tone of good society, had learned to perceive that regularity of forms 'did not necessarily 'conceal petrification of heart; that 'the *convenances* and 'courtesies of manner, in place of being only a uniform mask,

‘repressing the character of each individual under the same lines, rather serve to contain the passions without stifling them, colouring only that bald crudity of tone which is so injurious to their beauty, elevating that materialism which debases them, robbing them of that license which vulgarises them, lowering that vehemence which vitiates them’—all which, though rather exuberantly expressed, is in substance as true as gospel; and, thinking thus of society, Chopin naturally was restrained from any of ‘that eagerness to drink the cup of phantasy to the very dregs, that stormy pursuit of all the changes and incongruities of life,’ which constitutes the essence of what is called Bohemianism, and has exercised such a strong and often fatal fascination over so many men of genius.

In quoting Liszt’s study of Chopin, we do not accept unconditionally either the matter or the manner of his book. It contains a good deal of high-flown and overcharged sentiment, the effect of which is not improved, as the reader will have already perceived, by the style and diction of the English translation, which is as stilted and stumbling as English translations of musical books usually are; and there can be little doubt that it emphasises the impassioned and romantic side of the composer’s character at the expense of some other characteristics, and thus conveys an impression only partially true. We should hardly gather from it, for instance, what from other sources is evident, that Chopin was a man with a considerable vein of merriment in him, and efficient also in the delivery of neat and polished sarcasms. But, with all these allowances, our impression is, partly from internal evidence, that Liszt really understood Chopin, the inner and genuine Chopin, better than anyone else who has written about him, and that he furnishes more suggestions towards enabling others in turn to understand the feelings which were at the root of and gave impulse to the peculiar form and feeling of Chopin’s music than any other of his critics. Karasowski’s biography and Liszt’s study, taken together, afford us pretty good material for realising Chopin’s circumstances and character. His father was a Frenchman, who had transferred himself to Poland, and become Polish in his sympathies; and to this mingling of French descent with Polish education may perhaps be partly traced that union of Slavonic fire with grace and minuteness of finish which pervades his work. As a child, it is not surprising to read, he was so sensitive to music that he wept whenever he heard it. In his earlier musical career as a young man, he was before the public at first rather as a performer and extemporiser than as a composer, having acquired

a command of his instrument in which he was equalled by few, though he never possessed, as he himself observed, the physical power requisite to rouse and command the homage of any but a sympathising audience, and the preparation for a concert was, in his own words, ‘a dreadful time for me. I shut myself up in private and play Bach. That is my preparation:’ a choice which shows how well he was aware of the educating power, both to fingers and nerves, of the great master of musical logic, whose style might have been supposed by many to be the very last to be adopted as a preparation for the performance of his own entirely different school of music. He was as exacting towards himself in regard to composition as in playing, and ‘threw into the waste-paper basket many compositions which others would have been proud to hand to their publisher.’ His feeling in regard to show-playing, in which there was more of display than of serious art, as well as his sarcastic humour, are displayed in his brief criticism on Thalberg, in a private letter:—

‘Thalberg is here, and playing famously, but he is not the man for me. He is younger than I am, very popular with the ladies, makes pot-pourris on *La Muette*, plays *forte* and *piano* with the pedals, but not with his hands, takes tenths as I do octaves, and wears diamond studs. He does not at all admire Moscheles, so it is not surprising that the *tutti* were the only parts of my concerto that pleased him. He, too, writes concertos.’

This remark may be compared with what Moscheles said of Chopin’s own execution, that his soft passages were so delicate that no strong *forte* was required to give the desired contrast, so that he always preserved the relative proportion of strength in his shading, though unable to bring much physical power to his aid. His strictures on Thalberg’s less delicate handling probably arose, however, mainly from a dislike to the popular pianist’s artistic school; for he had no such feeling in regard to Liszt, but on the contrary, liked to hear his own larger compositions played by Liszt, with a grandeur of effect which he could not himself impart to them.

As we put together the further traits of Chopin’s character, which stand out most conspicuously in the various accounts of him, they grow into a figure the grace and interest of which can scarcely be exaggerated. To the charm of his personal appearance, in its union of masculine and feminine traits, we have the testimony both of Liszt and George Sand, in her portrait of Prince Karol in ‘*Lucrezia Floriani*;

sentimental interest to her novel, yet Liszt obviously does not consider her representation of his appearance and manners so much overdrawn as some have supposed, since he adopts her words occasionally in his own memoir. From the latter we gain, however, probably more truthfully, an idea of the peculiar charm of his personality, ‘stamped with so much high breeding, that involuntarily he was always treated *en prince* ;’ the impression of a character gentle and affectionate, but withal too proud and reserved to let anyone into the secret recesses of his feelings ; of a taste fastidiously delicate, drawn by a natural sympathy towards all that was beautiful in the world, happiest in the society of gentle and cultivated women, and next to them apparently caring for flowers above all other things except music. His favourite composer was Mozart, whose finish of form naturally attracted him ; for Beethoven he had not the same unconditional admiration—he found too much of strife and turmoil in the great composer’s more passionate outpourings, which he seems to have felt as disturbing the unity and balance of form in art, which he loved ; and in the same spirit he found Shakespeare too realistic for his ideas as to the province and limits of art.* In accordance with this temperament, it is not surprising to find that, in spite of his deep-seated and burning patriotism (which was, indeed, the moving spring of much of his music), he was no democrat ; ‘democracy presented to his view an agglomeration of elements too heterogeneous, too restless, wielding too much savage power, to win his sympathies,’ an opinion in which, however it be in disfavour at the present moment, he has at any rate the countenance of Shakespeare. Liszt’s further reference to his attitude in regard to politics may be quoted :—

‘The reserve which marked his intercourse with others extended to all subjects to which the fanaticism of opinion can attach. His own sentiments could only be estimated by that which he did not do in the narrow limits of his activity. His patriotism was revealed in the course taken by his genius, in the choice of his friends, in the preferences given to his pupils, and in the frequent and great services which he rendered to his compatriots ; but we cannot remember that he took any pleasure in the expression of this feeling. If he sometimes entered upon the topic of politics, so fiercely attacked, so warmly defended, so frequently discussed in France, it was rather to point out what he deemed dangerous or erroneous in the opinions of others than to win attention for his

* In the closing days of his last illness, when he was passing away as in a dream, an English lady, herself a great mistress of his instrument, frequently played to him at his own request. As the end drew near he said, ‘Play Mozart. I can listen to no other music now.’

own. In constant connexion with some of the most brilliant politicians of the day, he knew how to limit the relations between them to a personal attachment entirely independent of political interests. . . . Sincerely religious, and attached to Catholicity, Chopin never touched upon this subject, but held his faith without attracting attention to it. One might have been acquainted with him for a long time without knowing exactly what his religious opinions were.'

On the subject of his art alone he spoke, when necessary, or when any vital principle in connexion with it was in question, with an earnestness, decision, and tenacity in maintaining his ground which surprised those who had regarded him as too calm and stoical to be aroused into keen discussion. This was what he felt as his peculiar mission, and he had no sympathy with any musician who did not regard the art as a thoroughly serious and almost sacred calling; hence his bitterness against artists of the Thalberg school.

Around this grave, quiet, self-contained character, which was the basis of Chopin's nature, there flickered a lambent sarcasm, which could be used with some sharpness when he was in want of a weapon, but generally took rather the form of a good-natured and easy contempt for things and persons not answering to his ideal. His manner of showing this often reminds one of Heine, some of whose prejudices he shared: his dry description of what he found in Scotland—'They are ugly here, but good, it would seem; to make up for this shortcoming there are charming cattle, apparently vicious, perfect milk, butter, eggs, cheese, chickens, and such things'—might have come out of Heine's note-book.* In less trivial fancies he and Heine seem to have had a mutual understanding, insomuch that the latter, though certainly no musical connoisseur, was greatly drawn to Chopin's music; nor did they

'Lack the scholarship to talk in tropes'

thereupon, and understand each other as well as in 'the burghers' tongue.' In regard to the tragical story of Chopin's relations with a great literary genius of the other sex, it seems scarcely necessary to say much here—the subject has been discussed so often—further than this: that, whether in relation to the requirements of good taste, good feeling, or true and unselfish affection, George Sand's conduct appears to us to come out as badly as possible, balancing one account with another. True, she in the first instance nursed

* Quoted in an article on Chopin by Fr. Niecks, in a short-lived and now defunct musical journal.

him through an illness; but it seems clear that her part in the matter was that of an imperious and passionate nature, seeking always after new excitement, and that Chopin interested her as a man of genius of a new order, whose love she required and obtained as a sacrifice to her own impetuous instincts, and cast aside when she was wearied of it, after having made use of the adventure to furnish her with the plot of a new literary work. She even by implication confesses this, with an almost brutal frankness, in the person of Lucrezia Floriani: ‘Certes, elle avait été aimée, et elle avait été aimée ‘aussi très ardemment. Mais les organisations aussi exquisés ‘que celle de Karol sont bien rares, et elle n’en avait point ‘reueontré.’ There is the whole history in a nutshell, and Liszt’s account confirms it. One can hardly attach blame to Chopin, even according to the standard of conventional morality (which it is unnecessary to discuss here). He was simply a more weak and delicate nature drawn irresistibly into the vortex of a stronger one; and it is evident that he regarded the connexion as practically equivalent to marriage, and would have been faithful to death had she remained unchanged. The account of their first meeting is given by Liszt with more circumstance than elsewhere, and is graphic and picturesque enough. Chopin appears always to have thought of that period of his life as one of exquisite happiness, and even the anguish which he suffered when she drove him to the crisis she at last wished for, of saying in desperation that he would quit her for ever, does not seem to have interfered with his gratitude to her for having loved him; he never spoke of her without tears, and dwelt with a kind of bitter fascination on memories the brooding over which was, in fact, slowly sapping his life. According to Karasowski, George Sand had the almost incredible indelicacy to send him the proof-sheets of ‘Lucrezia’ for his perusal and approval before publication. When he had read it, either before or after publication, his feeling was expressed in a manner in keeping with his always chivalrous character. His misery and doubt as to the connexion had already commenced, but he said, ‘If I now desert the woman ‘whom I formerly esteemed and loved, I make the romance ‘a reality, and expose her to the blame, even the scorn, of the ‘strictly virtuous.’ It is not necessary, however, on account of our feelings in regard to the woman, to depreciate the authoress, or to deny to ‘Lucrezia Floriani’ its genuine literary merit, as some critics on the subject seem to have thought themselves bound to do. The book has many fine passages, and exhibits much power of character-painting, which might

be better appreciated, certainly, if one could forget the cruel way in which the materials for it were acquired.

To come from Chopin's personality to his art, perhaps one of the most remarkable facts about it is, that a composer of such intense and passionate musical feeling should have voluntarily chosen to confine himself within the narrow limits of the pianoforte, an instrument which would seem so little adapted, in its essential character as a percussion instrument (which is what it really is), to give expression to the strain of mournful yet voluptuous melody in which Chopin poured forth his inner soul, or to realise that delight in rich effects of tone-colouring which is indicated in his compositions. It seems, at first sight, almost as if a painter of exceptional powers should voluntarily confine himself to etching or engraving, and to the indications of colour effect which could be conveyed in such a medium. But, though there is no definite information as to the circumstances which may have influenced Chopin's choice of his medium of expression, it would seem after all that, with a happy intuition, he had recognised the special scope of his powers. It is, at all events, unquestionable that the orchestral parts of his two concertos are deficient in interest and effectiveness as orchestral writing, though this may perhaps result not so much from inherent inability to make the most of the orchestra, as from the fact of his not having specially studied it. However this may be, the spectacle of a composer of such true genius voluntarily confining himself to such a limited means of expression, and proceeding to develop from it a new treatment, to impart to it, as it were, powers which it was not before known to possess, yet which are entirely in keeping with its mechanism, is certainly one of the most interesting which the history of the art has to show us. From an æsthetic point of view Chopin's treatment of the pianoforte is of more interest, and stands more alone in regard to form and manner, than even that of Beethoven, many of whose sonatas may be called rather orchestral symphonies in pianoforte form. But Chopin's pianoforte music is the music of the keyboard, and no other medium could reproduce it. Liszt was evidently much impressed with Chopin's artistic attitude in this respect. In language critically true, though somewhat exuberant (as Liszt could hardly help being), he says—

‘In confining himself exclusively to the piano, Chopin has, in our opinion, given proof of one of the most eminent qualities of a composer—a just appreciation of the form in which he possessed the power to excel; yet this very fact, to which we attach so much importance, has been injurious to the extent of his fame. It would have been most

difficult for any other writer, gifted with such high harmonic and melodic powers, to have resisted the temptation of the *singing* of the bow, the liquid sweetness of the flute, or the deafening swells of the trumpet, which we still persist in believing to be the only forerunner of the antique goddess whose fickle favours we woo. What strong conviction, based upon reflection, must have been requisite to have induced him to restrict himself to a circle apparently so much more barren; what warmth of creative genius must have been necessary to have forced from its apparent aridity a fresh growth of luxuriant bloom, un hoped for in such a soil! What intuitive penetration is revealed by this exclusive choice, which, wresting the effects of the various instruments from their habitual domain, where the whole foam of sound would have broken at their feet, transported them into a sphere more limited, indeed, *but far more idealised!* (the italics are our own). 'What confident perception of the future powers of his instrument must have presided over his voluntary renunciation of an empiricism, so widely spread, that another would have thought it a mistake, a folly, to have wrested such great thoughts from their ordinary interpreters! How sincerely should we revere him for this devotion to the beautiful for its own sake, which induced him not to yield to the general propensity to scatter each light spray of music over a hundred orchestral desks, and enabled him to augment the resources of art, in teaching how they may be concentrated in a more limited space, elaborated at less expense of means, and condensed in time.'

The half-sentence to which we have called attention in the above quotation, in regard to the highly-idealised form of expression which is represented by Chopin's pianoforte music, is too important to be lightly passed over. In the perception of that lies the answer to the criticism which would undervalue the pianoforte as too restricted and imperfect a medium for the representation of ideas and of a style so recondite and poetic as that of Chopin. The instrument is imperfect and bounded in its means of expression; but that very imperfection may become the occasion of removing the musical idea further from the materialistic side of the art, into the region of abstract form and abstract expression, provided the listener bring imagination of his own to meet that of the composer. The pianoforte is mechanically the easiest and most convenient means of bringing within the grasp of one performer the combination of harmonic and melodic expression. Despite its narrow range in one sense, it has the advantage of moving more freely and equably within that range than any other single instrument. Though deficient in the effects arising from variety of *timbre*, or from the power of sustaining sounds and giving a singing expression to a melody, it can at least represent any melody and any harmonic combination with almost equal ease and freedom. What is wanting in its

power of expression must be partly supplied by the listener, whose fancy gives to the melody the sustained buoyancy and singing quality which the instrument mechanically cannot impart, and to the harmonies the warm or cool colouring of imagined shades of *timbre*. Imaginative music, uttered through this simple and colourless medium, thus affects the educated listener as much from within as from without, and the sounds which he hears with his outward ears become the abstract symbols of a tone-poetry coloured and filled in by his own imagination. In such a case, when the means of expression employed are restricted, the hearer's attention is more directly concentrated on the essential form of the musical idea, apart from all mere accidental means of heightening its effect; which is what Liszt meant by referring to the idealised form of Chopin's compositions. But Chopin provides for us a more delicate pleasure still, in the manner in which he has invented subtleties of style which are specially characteristic of the instrument he employs. Not only has he given us intensely emotional music for the pianoforte, but he has imported into it certain methods of handling and of evoking tone and expression, which, while not at variance with the highly-wrought feeling of the music, we feel to be peculiarly suited to the capabilities of the instrument, considerably extending its range of expression. The deficiency of tone-colour in Chopin's instrument was to be atoned for by what Liszt calls his 'graceful' and remarkable enlargements of the harmonic tissue, his peculiar and unexpected combinations, some of which would sound harsh and perplexing to the hearer if given in a more hard and decisive manner, but which, evoked by the light sweep of the hand over the successive notes of the combination, in the manner which the pianoforte alone affords the means for, are floated to the ear with all their crudity dispersed, in a vague fragrance of sound which reminds one of Bacon's comparison between music and the scent of flowers.* The defect of sustaining or singing power in the instrument was atoned for by the invention of a system of expressive ornamental passages or *floriture*, not imitated from those which are characteristic of vocal music, but producing the same kind of declamatory expression by means of passages such as bring out the most special capabilities of the instrument; passages in which the real elements of the melody are broken up into a chain of glittering points of sound, linked together, how-

* 'The breath of flowers is sweetest in the air, where it comes and goes, like the warbling of music.' — Essay 'Of Gardens.'

ever, into groups, each of which is complete in itself, and seems like the expansion of a single note or phrase into a passing rhapsody of melody. The appreciation of this peculiar adaptation of the form of the music to the means of expression, while it demands special æsthetic perception on the part of the listener, repays him with a special and refined pleasure. In hearing such a composition as the ‘*Etude in C sharp minor*,’ for instance, we seem to be witnesses of some impassioned scene of the interchange of human feeling, where love alternates with poignant regret, tender and clinging reproaches with passionate denunciation, but a scene in which the expression of all these feelings has in some weird manner become transfused into the language of the pianoforte; which presents to us the abstract elements of human emotion, disentangled from all accidents of time and place and specific idea, and expressing themselves solely through musical form.

Such a composition as that just alluded to represents, perhaps, the nearest approach which instrumental music can make to unfettered emotional expression, without losing the coherence of form, the loss of which in music is fatal to truly artistic character. In that and other such examples the coherence of artistic form is maintained by a resemblance of character and accent sustained throughout the composition, but which is to be felt rather than defined. In the majority of Chopin’s compositions, in which a much more symmetrical construction of the whole is maintained, the freedom of expression in detail is kept in its place by subordination to a uniform and almost unbroken rhythm, which constitutes the foundation of the composer’s delicately expressive and varied superstructure. Liszt observes how, in performance as well as in the actual structure of the music, this rhythmical basis was always kept by Chopin prominent and accentuated; ‘all his compositions should be played with this accentuated and measured swaying and balancing;’ and Moscheles indicates the same idea in his different manner, in saying that in listening to Chopin’s playing ‘we feel ourselves carried away as by a singer who, paying little heed to the accompaniment, abandons himself to his feelings.’ This is the key to the artistic form and expression of those exquisitely poetic musical reveries for which he adopted the name of ‘*Nocturnes*,’ a name vaguely expressive of the character of a music only to be thoroughly enjoyed in the repose of the day,

‘While the amorous, odorous wind
Breathes low between the sunset and the moon;
Or in a shadowy saloon,
On silken cushions half reclined;’

a form of composition of which Field had foreshadowed both the character and the name in his little-known works under the same title, but in a manner simple and *naïf* in comparison with the rich colouring and refined emotion of Chopin. For in the music of the latter the one quality which of all others is *not* to be detected is that of *naïveté*. Whether in these Nocturnes, in his mazurkas, sometimes sad and dreamy, sometimes bright and playful, or in the voluptuous *abandon* of his waltzes, the 'note' is always that of the *salon*; it is the efflorescence of the poetry of culture in its most intense yet most polished form; not the self-conscious and superficial culture of the 'æsthete,' but the spontaneous artistic expression of a culture deeply seated in mental habit and association, the poetry of a society whose emotions must be expressed, however earnestly or fancifully, with grace and dignity, whose Muse strings her lyre for no untought or rustic audience—

'Far capitals, and marble courts, her eye still seems to see,
Minstrels, and kings, and high-born dames, and of the best that be.'

The prevalence of this peculiarly refined and (in the best sense) aristocratic tone in Chopin's music suggests a recurrence to the subject of the relation between the composer and his works, between man and artist, which we have referred to as a matter often of more interest in the case of the comparatively lesser than in that of the greatest composers, and which we have observed to be more exemplified in the case of Schubert than some of his admirers are willing to perceive. In the case of Chopin the parallel between artist and man is so striking that the one side of him can hardly be understood apart from the other. He is one of the few eminent artists who may be said to have been first man, then artist; one who would no more have been regarded as a mere musician than Congreve was content to be reckoned as an author; and this relation between his circumstances and character and his music seems to have greatly struck Liszt, who occupies a considerable portion of his biographical study in elucidating what may be called the social ground-work of Chopin's peculiar style. Amid a good deal on this topic which is florid and sentimental, are interspersed hints and reflections which are at least very picturesque and suggestive, and illustrate Liszt's keen interest in the relation between life and art. In the peculiar combination of grace and playfulness with passionate feeling, which characterise so eminently the mazurkas and waltzes, and in a less special degree the Nocturnes, Liszt sees the reflection in music of the character and manners of the

Polish women, who inspire the spirit of the Polish dances, and on whom he lavishes an enthusiasm in which it must be admitted that he has the verdict of nearly all civilised Europe to support him. Only among them could be found, he says, those 'divine coqueties' which run through the whole tissue of Chopin's music; only among them could a poet hope to find any approach to a realisation of Chateaubriand's exquisitely *spirituel* fancy, the dream 'of an Ève, innocent, yet fallen: 'ignorant of all, yet knowing all; mistress, yet virgin;' only among them that union of Parisian grace and culture with Oriental fire, of love and devotion with the passion for heroism. Of the pervading melancholy which is the background of so much of Chopin's music, even of that which is light and brilliant in outward form, Liszt relates the composer's own strange attempt at a definition, given in a moment of unusual breaking through of his habitual reserve about his own feelings, in answer to a question from a lady:—

'She asked him, what was the cause of the involuntary but sad veneration which subdued her heart while listening to these pieces, apparently presenting only sweet and graceful subjects, and by what name he called the strange emotion inclosed in his compositions, like ashes of the unknown dead in superbly sculptured urns of the purest alabaster. . . . He replied that her heart had not deceived her in the gloom which she felt stealing upon her, for whatever might have been his transitory pleasures, he had never been free from a feeling which might almost be said to form the soil of his heart, and for which he could find no appropriate expression except in his own language, no other possessing a term equivalent to the Polish word "*Zal*." * As if his ear thirsted for the sound of this word, which expresses the whole range of emotions produced by an intense regret, through all the shades of feeling, from hatred to repentance, he repeated it again and again.'

Goethe doubted whether the same words conveyed precisely the same idea to any two minds, and Chopin's '*Zal*' conveys to us no more distinct idea as to the intellectual or emotional basis of his music than we can gather from the music itself; but the anecdote is interesting as implying a confession on the part of the composer of the intimate relation subsisting, in his own mind, between his national and his musical feeling: and if Liszt is correct in saying that '*Zal*' includes the idea not only of regret but of agitation and revolt, it serves to indicate a link between the originating feeling of the Nocturnes and

* Janusz, in his Dictionary, gives the equivalent of '*Zal*' as '*regret*' '*douloureux*,' but with intimations of various shades of meaning. '*Zal*' seems to be to Chopin's music what we might say '*Sehnsucht*' is to Schubert's.

mazurkas, and that of the apparently very different class of compositions called ‘Polonaises,’ which are among Chopin’s most remarkable and characteristic productions. Liszt has a good deal to say as to the real character and meaning of these compositions, which he implies, not without reason, is much misunderstood. The name of the dance in its original form was masculine, not feminine as in the adopted French form of the word; it was a processional type of dance, in which for once the men rather than the women played the more prominent part, and which was ‘to display manly beauty, to set off ‘noble and dignified deportment, martial yet courtly bearing.’ In these two latter epithets, says Liszt, ‘martial yet courtly,’ we almost see the Polish character defined; and could there, we may add, be a finer type of national character, than that which is summed up in these two epithets? And that type is faithfully reflected in Chopin’s Polonaises. The less highly-wrought and intense compositions which constitute the average type of Polonaise, suggest the idea of a brilliant and picturesque procession of men and women in rich costumes, of gay head-dresses and flowing scarfs, the clank of swords and spurs, and the flash of diamonds; but with Chopin the march is not in the ball-room but in the battle-field. His Polonaise is Poland in revolt against tyrants, or in mourning for her sons who have fallen in the strife; for in most of the Polonaises the two feelings are blent or contrasted; nor is the feminine element absent from them. The turmoil and strife of one is interrupted by a graceful and delicate mazurka, like the surviving memory of happy days, soon to be brushed aside again in the conflict; in another, the great one in A flat, the shout of a whole people for freedom and fatherland is followed by the march past of the army, drums beating and colours flying, and the resumption of the song of liberty at the close. Of all Tyrtæan strains that have ever been written, this (a little hackneyed of course, now, through being overplayed) is surely the wildest and most stirring, while the heroic and chivalrous character of the principal *motif* raises it almost to the dignity of a martial hymn; ‘martial yet courtly,’ for even in his heroics Chopin always maintains the tone of distinction, of nobility, nor does he in this ardent piece of music ever for a moment lose his sense and grasp of artistic form; every note is in its place, everything is finished down to the minutest detail.* Had he been

* We remember that in the course of one of Liszt’s last visits to London he sat down to the piano after breakfast and played in his own magnificent style one of those marvellous compositions. When it

known only by this and his Funeral March, which is equally grand in style, he would probably have been regarded as one of the greatest of composers, over the loss of whose other works we could only mourn. Taking his compositions *en masse*, we recognise that there is a limit to his range which must prevent his taking the highest rank; that he could only move freely in his own special path; and his concertos and sonatas, considered as wholes, show that the classic forms of composition fettered him and dulled the edge of his musical fancy and interfered with the cunning of his workmanship to some extent. But he remains a remarkable and indeed unique example of a composer who has achieved all but the highest place by works on a small scale and written for an instrument in some senses very limited in its power of expression; while his character as man and artist forms an instructive comment on that form of vulgarity which regards the possession of genius as an excuse for slovenly habits and uncourteous manners; a superstition which has done much, at different times, to separate art and society, to the detriment of both, but often much more from the fault of the artists than the latter are at all willing to believe.

If Liszt, in the critical sketch we have been following, has been guilty of some exuberance and rhapsodising, a Nemesis has certainly overtaken him in the manner in which he himself is undergoing biographical exhibition at the hands of one of his feminine admirers. The heading of one chapter—‘Eros as a child of the Romantic’—will give the reader some inkling as to the sort of thing which he may expect to find in Fräulein Ramann’s pages. The book is an example, in short, of the incredibly silly and tawdry sentimentalising which is to be found in perfection only in musical biographies. The style of the authoress finds every justice at the hands of her translator, who seems to be a mistress of the Laura Matilda school of prose writing, and who furthermore enlivens her translation by musical blunders such as we have before had occasion to notice on the part of another feminine translator of musical letters and biographies, and alludes to Beethoven’s ‘Symphony ‘in D sharp,’ and Mendelssohn’s ‘Concerto in G flat.’ In short, the book is, from a literary and critical point of view, pretentious and absurd to a degree, and absurdly translated; and, having said thus much, we may dismiss it from further special consideration, save as a text on which to hang some comments

was done, he broke off, exclaiming ‘Il n’y a pas un de nous, hors Chopin, qui pût écrire cette page.’

on the artistic career of the remarkable man who is the subject of it.

Liszt was, perhaps, even more emphatically than Chopin, one of those artists whose personality was as interesting as his work; or, rather, his personality is fully as interesting as that of Chopin, though his work is (to our thinking) much less so. Critically speaking, he was, before all things, essentially a great pianoforte executant—the greatest that has ever appeared. In this respect he stood, during the period when he was still before the public in that capacity, entirely alone. In illustration of the impression which his playing then made upon a hearer very well qualified to judge, we may quote here a few words of the late Henry Chorley, who, together with the Editor of this Review, was much in Liszt's society in his earlier days. Chorley writes (date 1845):—

'As a player, Liszt rises above his mates as something of a different genius, a different race, a different world, to everyone else who has handled the piano. He is not to be considered among the great composers also pianists, who have merely treated their instrument as an interpreting medium, but as a poet who executively employed the piano as his means of utterance, and materials for creation. In mere mechanical skill, after everyone else had ended, Liszt had still something to add: he could carry every man's discovery further, could exhibit it in new forms. If he was surpassed by Thalberg in richness of sound, he surpassed Thalberg by a variety of tone of which the redoubtable and equable Viennese player never dreamed. He had his delicate, and light, and freakish moods (as when playing the "Ständchen" of Schubert, or his transcripts of the *tarentellas* and *calascionate* of Naples), in which he may be remembered as another Chopin, for every quality of fancy, sentiment, and fairy brilliancy which made Chopin so delicious. In sweep of hand and rapidity of finger—in fire and in fineness of execution—in the power over those exquisite momentary fancies and graceful touches which, when the music admits of it, add so much to its charm—in a memory so vast and comprehensive as to seem almost superhuman—in a lightning quickness of view, enabling him to penetrate instantaneously the meaning of a new composition, and to light it up properly with its own inner spirit (some touches of his own brilliancy added), in a mastery complete, spontaneous, enjoying and giving enjoyment, over every style and every school of music; all those who have ever heard Liszt frequently, will join with me in saying he was unapproached among executant instrumentalists.' *

* From a collection of essays, published together in 1854, under the title 'Modern German Music,' including some criticisms of real value and penetration (e.g. the chapter on Spohr), entitling their author to much more respect than his successors in the same field are in the habit of bestowing on him, though some of his musical judgments are now out of date.

In such qualities it was that Liszt excelled all his contemporaries in pianoforte-playing. Nor has his successor in this respect appeared. He was as much a phenomenon as Paganini, and is the only man in the pianoforte-playing world who, as an executant, could be regarded as holding a kind of parallel place with that of Paganini among violin executants. But to draw such a parallel unconditionally would be doing Liszt very scant justice; for Paganini, with all his wonderful powers, was artistically a splendid *farceur*, and would be so regarded if he were to reappear in our present stage of musical culture; whereas Liszt, however he may for a time have enjoyed the display of his unequalled executive power and the adulation which it brought him, was always an artist with serious aims, and regarded the extension of the technique of pianoforte-playing as a means, not as an end in itself. He sympathised in reality so little with the tight-rope school of musical exhibitors as to have refused to make acquaintance with Kalkbrenner's *bravura* study for the left hand, saying impatiently that he 'did not know it and did not want to know it;' and his plainly-expressed judgment as to the artistic value of Thalberg's pianoforte compositions has been completely confirmed by general musical opinion since, though it must be admitted that he showed great want of taste and tact in publishing a criticism on Thalberg at a time when he and Thalberg were before the public virtually as rival pianists. The nature of Liszt's addition to the mere executive scope of pianoforte-playing was very different from that on which Thalberg prided himself. The special achievement of the latter consisted in the invention of the device of sustaining a melody in the middle portion of the keyboard, by the help of the pedal, amid an accompaniment of arpeggios and other ornamental passages flying right and left; a device very brilliant and striking when new, but which was soon picked up and has been long a commonplace of 'show' pianoforte writers.* But Liszt's innovations were of a much more robust and musician-like order than this. So far as they can be described in general terms, they consisted in a remarkable enlargement in the design and scale of pianoforte passages, so that a 'figure' which with the old school of players would have been expressed in single notes and in the compass say of an octave, becomes with

* Mendelssohn, with his characteristic alertness, picked up the effect at once and introduced it as a new reading in the free arpeggio passages of Bach's 'Chromatic Fantasia;' he describes it in one of his letters, observing that 'the people say it is quite as good as Thalberg.'

Liszt a battery of double notes or chords spreading over great part of the keyboard; the old simple arpeggio accompaniment to a melody becomes an elaborate device of interlacing chords bringing out all the body of tone in the instrument; everything in the form of the music becomes broader, ampler, and more sonorous; and so completely is this in the line of legitimate development of the best effects of the instrument that one can imagine that Beethoven, could he have become acquainted with this enlarged method of playing, would have rewritten many passages in his concertos and later sonatas (the earlier ones he would not have thought worth retouching), in order to give his ideas with the added effect and power to be gained from Liszt's broader style of handling.

In this respect Liszt's best writing for the instrument on which he excelled every other executant will probably always remain as an example of what can be done with the pianoforte, nor is it very likely that anyone will surpass him in the *exécution transcendante* which his *études* profess in so many words to exemplify. But he has for many years practically retired from the public profession of a *virtuoso*, and he and his admirers have demanded that he should now be judged as a composer. Possibly the time has hardly come yet to form a balanced judgment between the extreme repulsion which much of his music exercises upon some critics, and the enthusiasm with which it is admired by his partisans. That Liszt himself is actuated by a very serious aim in his compositions we do not doubt; the question is, whether there is not too much of serious aim, too self-conscious an intention to be poetic and original. Liszt appears to us to be, as a composer, one of those ambitious and strong-willed men who often figure in the decadence of an art, who are determined to be great and to make other people think them so, who mistake this determination for spontaneous power, and, in the absence of the gift of originating beautiful things, make unto themselves a theory of art and set to work doggedly to exemplify it in their productions. That Liszt thus worshipped a theory is set forth in so many words by the author of the ecstatic biography before us. According to her, he was possessed with the idea of an ultimate escape from the domain of all arbitrarily measured intervals in music, of a system of harmony 'arriving where the boundaries which separate diatonics, chromatics, and enharmonics fall, and the *ordre omnitonique* is reached, whereby each sphere of feeling will find its corresponding colour of tone.' All we need say at present is that, as such an art of music would demand, for its very existence

to us, a faculty in the discrimination of intervals such as our ears do not now possess, and would deal with sounds on a principle radically different from that of the art of music as hitherto practised, we can afford to adjourn the ultimate consideration of it *sine die*. The biographer avers that, acting on a belief in this general view, Liszt 'had the courage of his convictions,' and that 'he always proved the soundness of his 'new harmonious' (harmonic?) 'combinations, and tried them 'in the light of the idea of truth' (whatever that may mean). That he had the courage of his convictions our ears on not a few occasions have certainly received undeniable though painful evidence; whether he at the same time has proved the soundness of his 'harmonious' conceptions, the wise may make some grains of a scruple, or even a scruple itself. *Solvitur ambulando* is after all the ultimate test of any theory of artistic production; and Liszt's music, on the whole, does not 'go.' It has been a good deal nursed and advertised by special admirers in this country, a system which in itself disposes one to look doubtfully on the article thus pushed, for all previous analogy shows that what is sound in art can make its way without proclamations in the market-place, and that these are usually made use of to persuade people to like something against their will, or to collect a circle of sworn adherents from among the class who cultivate a taste for *caviare*. The device entitled the 'Metamorphosis of Themes' has been specially developed by Liszt; a device which, as we have observed on a previous occasion, is in reality a contrivance to enable composers who have little power of spontaneous melodic origination to make one melody serve for a whole work, by cutting it up in various ways, and presenting it in various dressings. It is a kind of Mrs. Glasse's system of musical cookery, of which the initial precept is 'first catch your 'melody,' a part of the process which, with Liszt, as well as with lesser operators of the same school, appears to be the most difficult of all. Liszt's unquestionable successes seem to have lain in the art of arranging other people's ideas for the piano in new forms and with new effects; the art of 'transcription,' or, as he called it 'partition pour le piano;' in other words 'scoring' for the keyboard. In this he was an unequalled master; but this is a form of composition which is in its nature ephemeral. 'Arrangements' do not live long, more especially when they are made partly for the display of the special and exceptional executive powers of the arranger. Some of his 'Symphonic Poems' for orchestra arrest the hearer by the intensity of passion which struggles to express

itself through the thick folds of an involved and confused musical form; and the Pianoforte Concerto in E flat will probably long be a favourite with pianists of the first force, on account of the brilliancy and effectiveness of the solo part, while it displays a degree of artistic unity and coherence of form not to be found in most of his larger works. Of the others of the more important compositions which we have had the opportunity of hearing in execution, the Pianoforte Concerto in A, and the Oratorio, the 'Legend of St. Elizabeth,' have left upon us (with the exception of some passages in the latter) an impression of absolute musical ugliness such as we have experienced from no other music that we can remember: they suggest the phrase which Mendelssohn harshly applied, certainly with far less reason, to some of Schubert's instrumental compositions—'schlechte musik,' 'nasty music,' as Sir G. Grove translates it. The stereotyped comment, of course, on all such feelings is, that all music which has extended the resources of the art has been condemned at first. The reluctance to approve anything which is new in art is, no doubt, a persistently recurring form of Philistinism; but it does not seem to be recognised that there is an opposite form of Philistinism, nearly as injurious to art, which is capable of habituating itself to like anything to which it has become accustomed: and very often the critical sensitiveness which recoils from a work at first hearing, as false in taste, proves to be nearer the truth than the induration of artistic perception which will accept, on principle, what it is predetermined to approve. And in music, as has been before remarked in these pages,* there are after all definite physical boundaries which cannot be passed, and in relation to which all experiments in composition and effect must ultimately be considered. We do not decline still to hold a suspended opinion in regard to Liszt's place as a composer; but we entertain the strong conviction that when weighed in the inexorable balances of Time he will be found wanting, and that the idea that he is a great and important contributor to the world's possessions in musical creation will prove to be a delusion. Great aims and grand theories are so far from producing great art, that they are more usually the refuge of men who have more ambition than real genius. Liszt seems to have been possessed by the idea, which he derived from the Abbé Lammenais, that art is, like science, eternally progressive, and that every step in it is a step onward: an idea which the critics of the 'progress' party

are constantly flourishing about. People who are so blind to the past history of the arts, and so utterly confused in their logical perceptions as not to see the essential distinction between the objects and conditions of science and art, are at least out of the reach of illustration or argument.

Liszt's character, as represented in the book before us (so far as one can disentangle fact from sentimental exaggeration) appears as phenomenal as his artistic position. A musical prodigy, with a European fame, at a time when other boys are most interested with school games, he had even in his teens begun to think the career of a 'virtuoso' unsatisfactory and beneath his aspirations, and to feel *blasé* and weary of applause; though it was not till years afterwards that he acted upon this feeling by retiring from public exhibition of his powers. Apparently a sincere and even enthusiastic religious devotee throughout his life, he could nevertheless set at defiance public opinion in regard to conventional moralities, and seems to have been, in this respect as in his art, 'a law unto himself.' Impatient of all contradiction and criticism, and prepared to return blow for blow with interest to any of his opponents, he has been chivalrous and generous towards his social and artistic allies, as well with his words and his pen as with the easier, more showy, but also more practical generosity which exhibits itself in lavish distributions from a well-filled purse. Of his really princely munificence in this respect, the story of his taking on himself the whole probable cost and possible risks in relation to the Beethoven Festival and Monument at Bonn, when the affair seemed about to fall through from deficiency of funds as well as of energy on the part of those who had first started it, is only one among other instances equally creditable to him. Though, like Chopin, he was essentially a musician of the *salon*, and in some senses what is called a born aristocrat, he had no conventional respects or ceremonies, was ready to answer even a crowned fool according to his folly, and appears to have preserved throughout his life the pride which is displayed in his early determination—when left after the death of his father to shape his own course in life—not to allow his art to be stamped 'as a source of amusement for distinguished society. I would sooner be anything in the world than a musician in the pay of great folk, patronised and paid by them like a conjuror;' a sentiment less frequent among distinguished artists fifty years ago than at present. He exclaimed one night to Lady Blessington at Gore House, where he had been received with great cordiality: 'Croyez-vous, Miladi, que je fasse de la musique pour m'amuser?' On the

other hand, Count d'Orsay, struck by his amazing conversational powers, said of him: 'Quel dommage que cet homme fasse de la musique!' He struck one as a man whose nervous energy could accomplish anything. Just before a concert at Stafford House, at which Liszt was to play the great duet on the *motifs* of 'Norma' with Benedict, he was thrown out of a carriage and sprained his right hand. Liszt played his part in the duet with his left hand only, the right being in a sling.

Of his personal appearance—the intense expression of his countenance with its keen eye, aquiline features, and compressed lips—a very good idea is given by the profile engraved in the 'Dictionary of Music,' the portrait illustrations in which seem throughout to have been selected with great care and judgment. The two volumes of the biography at present before us conclude with the period of his rupture with the Countess d'Agoult, when 'the contention was so sharp between them' that, like Paul and Barnabas, they parted in opposite directions, he to Vienna, she to Paris. On the story of this connection, the most important social episode of Liszt's life, it is as unnecessary as it would be unsuitable to enlarge here, though his biographer is troubled with no scruples of reticence in her book. But one can hardly help remarking on the strange social parallel between the experiences of Liszt and Chopin, each of whom went through an early and tender attachment which came to no result; each of whom was in later life captured—so to speak—by a *femme incomprise* older than himself; and each of whom had to see this connexion violently dissevered with pain, difficulties, and heart-burnings. In either case *éclat* rather than affection seems to have been the moving spring on the feminine side. Our opinion of the nature of George Sand's feeling towards Chopin we have already expressed; and as to the other affair, Fräulein Ramann observes, with delightful *naïveté*, that when Liszt had tact enough to feel that in making a concert tour throughout Europe it would be necessary to separate from the Countess, the latter, 'whose mind was bent on travelling at the side of a man who was in constant intercourse with men of wit, elegance, and rank, would not, of course, see the necessity of this.' The parallel fails in one important particular; that while Chopin's mistress drove him from her, Liszt was under the necessity of escaping from his, and did not achieve his freedom without some episodes not very consistent with dignity or self-respect on either side.* Both stories, however, may be

* In justice to Liszt, it should be added that he does not appear

said to point the same moral, viz., that in the promotion of happiness and mutual respect between men and women in the most important relation of life, the prosaic expedient of legal marriage presents, even for poets and artists, certain advantages. Indeed, it may be doubted whether the discomfort or unhappiness that has sprung from ill-assorted marriages is in the least comparable, in proportion to the numbers on either side, to that which has arisen in connexion with unions based purely on sentiment, however idealised and romantic.

But this is 'from the canon,' perhaps, in an essay dealing rather with music than morality. There is, however, an artistic as well as a social morality, upon which, as we have once or twice suggested *en passant*, some lights are thrown by the comparison of the life and works of the three composers of whom we have been speaking. The conclusion forced upon us is, that Chopin, who produced the least work and chose the most modest and restricted path of the three, is artistically the first and the most valuable to the world. He did not, like Schubert, dissipate his powers by rushing thoughtlessly and with a light heart into every department of musical composition; he did not, like Liszt, parade ambitious theories about his mission, or discover that 'the true salvation of art lay only in a great 'religious and philosophical synthesis.' He perceived early where his best powers lay, devoted his delicate and refined æsthetic perception to conscientiously turning those powers to their fullest account, and left a comparatively few exquisitely refined and original works which place him higher than many composers of far more ambitious aims (just as a few square inches of canvas covered by Meissonier are of more value than whole walls splashed over by Doré), and the beauty of which appeals to, and can be fully appreciated by, only the most refined and cultivated class of hearers.

to have been influenced by fickleness or want of feeling so much as by a very excusable desire to 'range himself' and to become respectable in the eyes of society: he would have been willing, if the Countess could have obtained a dispensation from her first marriage, to have entered into legal union with her; but the suggestion seems to have been received by the lady in much the same temper as that of Lydia Languish, when she found there was to be 'no elopement.'

ART. VIII.—1. *Histoire de la Guerre Civile en Amérique.* Par M. le Comte DE PARIS, ancien Aide de Camp du Général MacClellan. Tomes V. et VI. 8vo. Paris: 1883.

2. *Campaigns of the Civil War.* Vol. VI. Chancellorsville and Gettysburg. By ABNER DOUBLEDAY, Brevet-Major-General, U.S.A., commanding the First Corps at Gettysburg. Vol. VIII. The Mississippi. By FRANCIS VINTON GREENE, Lieut. of Engineers, U.S.A., late Military Attaché to the U.S. Legation at St. Petersburg. 12 vols. 12mo. New York: 1882.

3. *The Navy in the Civil War.* Vol. III. The Gulf and Inland Waters. By Commander A. T. MAHAN, U.S.N. 3 vols. 12mo. New York: 1883.

THE event which we anticipated in the concluding pages of our last number has taken place, and the illustrious author of the ‘History of the Civil War in America’—the former aide-de-camp of General MacClellan—is now the head of the royal family of France, and the undoubted inheritor of the monarchy in that country. The branch of Orleans is become the main stem of the House of Bourbon; the dissensions which have broken out in various forms in the last two hundred years, not without evil results to the nation and the throne, are at an end; the party names of ‘Legitimist’ and ‘Orleanist’ have lost their meaning; and the friends of constitutional monarchy are agreed that if ever that form of government is re-established in France the throne can only be filled by the prince, who represents by his birth the traditions of the crown, and by his education and his principles the colours and the liberties of France. In presence of the Republic there is now one clear alternative. Yet we confidently affirm that the French Republic has nothing to fear from the attacks, whether open or clandestine, of its rival; if it perishes, it will be by the amazing faults and follies and corruption of its own servants and supporters. Its fate is in their hands. Meanwhile, the conduct both of the prince and of the royalist party has been prudent, moderate, and united. No political demonstration has followed this event, except that the Legitimist committees have been spontaneously dissolved, and the Legitimist newspapers dropped. The Comte de Paris has returned to his seat at Eu, where he leads the life of a country gentleman, more occupied with literature than with politics. If ever he is called upon to enter upon the

stage of public life, it will not be as the minister of reaction, revolution, and storm, but rather as the healer of wounds, the enemy of faction, the consolidator of parties, the harbinger of concord and of peace. And meantime, we have, in the volumes now before us, a very conclusive proof that during the last ten years he has been far otherwise engaged than in weaving a network of political intrigue. They form part of a history of such magnitude and such minuteness as to warrant us in saying that it has certainly not been prepared and written as a relaxation from more serious business; and although the military experience of the Comte de Paris was short, they show an amount of knowledge of the art of modern warfare which entitles him to a high rank amongst military historians.

The earlier volumes have been already reviewed in this Journal by the pen of a valued contributor, now, alas! no longer with us; * and on the present occasion it is unnecessary for us to do more than refer to the opinion then expressed, both as to the general merit of the Comte de Paris's narrative, and of the partiality which he has not unnaturally manifested for the side with which he served. The fifth and sixth volumes, now published, are devoted exclusively to the events of the year 1863, which may be considered as the turning-point in the fortunes of the war, or as marking the ebb of the tide which before long was to leave the Confederacy a stranded and hopeless wreck; and they relate the details of the important events which then happened with an exactness, a fulness, and, on the whole, with a fairness which American writers have seldom been able to attain.

In the studied moderation of their language, the several writers of the 'Campaigns of the Civil War,' as also of the kindred series, 'The Navy in the Civil War,' are, indeed, for the most part, conspicuous exceptions. Mr. Greene, who belongs to a later generation, is markedly so; so also is Captain Mahan. General Doubleday, an old artillery officer, held an important command during the campaigns of which he has written; his testimony on many points is that of an eye-witness, and his military criticisms have often a particular and personal value; but his writing is frequently disfigured by a vehemence and prejudice which are alike unpleasing to the reader; and he seldom designates his former opponents by any other name than that of 'rebels,' a term equally incorrect in law and history, which has now no meaning, unless perhaps as an insult to a defeated enemy. But putting the ques-

* Colonel Chesney in 'Edinburgh Review,' vol. cxliv. p. 79.

tion of mere language on one side, the volumes are all written too exclusively from the Federal point of view—events are described as they appeared to the Federals: the official reports are those made to the Federal Government; and the evidence of Confederates is seldom referred to, except to state its inaccuracy as not agreeing with Northern opinion. In this respect the work of the Comte de Paris is far superior; and though its great bulk, and its full, its almost excessive detail takes it out of the category of books for the general reader, it is, and will probably remain for many years, the standard history of the war. We must, however, call attention to one rather important blemish: the maps, forming parts of a folio atlas, are exceedingly inconvenient; they are seldom directly referred to, so that it is not always easy to tell which map is wanted; and when the right one is found, it is a general map, not a particular plan; it is smothered in a quantity of irrelevant details, but gives no indication of the military positions or movements described in the text. Though very superior as works of art, they stand, for actual use, far below the rude, simple sketches given in the pages of the Campaigns.

After varied fortunes both in the East and West, the year 1862 had ended in disaster for the Federals; on the Rapahannock, they had just sustained the murderous repulse at Fredericksburg; whilst on the Mississippi, their advance had been severely checked in front of the fortifications of Vicksburg. In England, we perhaps heard more of the campaign in Virginia; but it may be doubted whether, from a strategical point of view, the struggle on the Mississippi was not more important. The closing of the traffic by the Confederates was a virtual and effective blockade of the great Western States, which had, indeed, a certain preference for the Union, but a much stronger one for their own interests, and which might, it was apprehended, join the party of secession if the stoppage of their trade was not removed. The clearance of the Mississippi was thus a measure on which the Federal Government insisted, and towards which the Federal army and navy had been strenuously labouring for the last eighteen months. Point after point where the Confederates had raised formidable batteries—Columbus, Island No. 10, Fort Pillow, and Memphis—had held the improvised ironclads at bay, but had fallen as soon as the troops threatened their unprotected rear. New Orleans had also fallen to the brilliant attack of Farragut, and it was believed that the river was almost won.

Vicksburg alone was still held by the Confederates, and as yet was very imperfectly fortified. Farragut, bringing part of

his squadron from New Orleans, passed it without much difficulty on June 28, 1862, and wrote to the Secretary of the Navy: 'The forts can be passed, and we have done it, and can do it again, as often as may be required of us;' and though he added, 'It will not, however, be an easy matter for us to do more than silence the batteries for a time, as long as the enemy has a large force behind the hills to prevent our landing and holding the place,' still, no one, not even Farragut himself, thought that there would be any special difficulty about reducing it, now that experience had shown how these riverside fortresses were to be captured.* It was some months before the peculiar strength of Vicksburg was clearly recognised.

The formation of the valley of the lower Mississippi is described in every treatise on physical geography. By the wearing action of the stream, and by frequent changes of its bed, the existing channel winds through a vast alluvial plain, nearly a hundred miles wide, but barely above the mean level of the water, and whose surface, even where it is not frequently submerged, is deeply furrowed by old river-beds, lakes, creeks, streams and backwaters, which, under the local name of *bayous*, render it sometimes doubtful whether the tract adjacent to the river should be spoken of as land or water. From this low-lying alluvial plain the adjacent country rises abruptly to a height of from two to three hundred feet, forming, and more markedly on the east side, a line of hills which, when the windings of the river bring it to their base, become steep bluffs, but in other places, and under the gentler conditions of weathering, are of more or less easy ascent. From the mouth of the Ohio to Memphis, the course of the river keeps pretty close to the hills on the east: the bluffs are frequent, and afforded a threatening command to the batteries which the Confederates erected on them. But at Memphis the two lines separate; that of the hills trends to the east, that of the river to the west; and they do not again meet for a distance of more than 200 miles in a straight line from north to south. Between them they enclose a tract of the low alluvial land, about sixty miles from east to west in its broadest part: this is traversed by numberless bayous, and by a river which, after receiving several affluents, takes the name of the Yazoo, flows to the south along the base of the hills, and falls into the Mississippi close to where the bluffs again meet the river, and where, on the top of the cliff, stood the fortifications of Vicksburg.

* Life of David Glasgow Farragut, First Admiral of the United States Navy, by his son, Loyall Farragut (8vo, 1882), p. 279.

To cross this low country on foot, and with a military train, was impracticable; it was therefore not possible to use the river as the line of communication, to land some miles above the town, work round to the rear of the forts, and so take possession. To move his army south from Memphis along the higher ground, utilising the Mississippi Central Railway, was what Major-General Grant, then in command, was anxious to attempt. This, however, meant an extended campaign; Grant was not a favourite at Washington; and petty intrigue threw so many obstacles in the way, that it was not till near the end of the year that he received permission to go south if he liked. Meantime the batteries and fortifications at Vicksburg had been powerfully strengthened, and the Confederate General, Pemberton, held the line of the Yallahusha River with a force of 30,000 men. But it was supposed that this was enlarged at the expense of the garrison of Vicksburg; and it seemed not improbable that a sudden attack on the fortifications, from the river, might be successful; or that if the higher ground could be reached, Pemberton, caught between two armies, each of strength equal to his own, must either be crushed, or retire southwards, leaving Vicksburg to its fate.

The command of this attacking force, amounting to 32,000 men, was entrusted by Grant to Major-General Sherman, who left on December 20, and on the 25th mustered his troops at Milliken's Bend, about twenty miles above Vicksburg. It had been hoped that they might be carried or convoyed by the gunboats some distance up the Yazoo, and so landed on the right of the Confederate batteries; but a *reconnaissance* a few days before had shown that the stream was closed by torpedoes, which prevented any passage beyond the front of the enemy's lines; and in attempting to remove these, one of the ironclads had been blown up and sunk in mid-channel. It was therefore necessary to land absolutely in front, on a triangular space, of very limited area, between the Yazoo and the line of bluffs; but it was found, when too late, that this space was traversed by a bayou, known as the Chickasaw Bayou, fordable in only five places, each of which was commanded by a hostile battery. Sherman having come so far was not the man to draw back without at least trying; but his men were mown down by hundreds without the possibility of any effective return; and he was finally compelled to draw off, after having sustained a loss of some 2,000 killed, wounded, and taken prisoners. The repulse was more decisive than it otherwise might have been, for the Confederate cavalry had meantime been ravaging the country in Grant's rear, had broken up the railways, cut the

telegraph wires, and destroyed several weeks' supplies, which he had collected at Holly Springs, a station on the line. Grant had therefore, at the very critical moment of the campaign, been compelled to fall back, and Pemberton had seized the opportunity to reinforce the garrison of Vicksburg. Sherman was thus opposed not by the proportionate part of 5,000, at which the garrison had been estimated, but by at least 12,000 men mustered on the bluff above Chickasaw Bayou.

The direct attack having thus failed, and the task of turning the northern flank of the enemy's works appearing very difficult, it was resolved to try if they could not be turned on the south. But to carry the troops down the river, past the batteries, was impossible; it would have been butchery to attempt it. For any attack from the south, means must be found to evade the river passage in front of the town. What first suggested itself was a canal. Vicksburg stood in the bight of a singularly deep bend of the river, having opposite to it the point of a long narrow spit of low land. Nothing appeared more simple than to cut through the neck of this peninsula. Several years before, in a boundary dispute between the States of Louisiana and Mississippi, the former had attempted in this way to cut off Vicksburg from the river; the attempt had failed, for the river had refused to be diverted, and the dispute had been settled without involving Vicksburg in ruin. The idea was now revived, and several thousand men were set to work to dig out the old canal. From a distance, Grant had favoured the scheme; and though, when he came to the spot, he was quick to see that at both ends the canal would open into an eddy, and to suspect that it could no more succeed now than it had succeeded before, he permitted the work to go on, almost because he saw nothing else to do. It was thus continued from January 22 to March 7, and the excavation was nearly completed when on this latter day the river rose suddenly, broke down the barrier at the upper end, and flooded the whole peninsula, destroying all the stores that were collected there, and driving the troops on to the raised dykes to escape drowning. But though the canal was filled to overflowing, no stream would run through it and scour it out; and when the troops attempted to resume their labours, some batteries thrown up at Warrenton, on a bluff a few miles below the town, drove them off. What art had thus twice failed in doing, the river did very thoroughly of its own accord some years later. In April 1876 it broke through the peninsula about the middle of its length, dug out a new channel, blocking up the old one and the front of Vicksburg with a bed of

mud that threatens the town with absolute destruction. The new channel, however, is at a point which, in 1863, was equally commanded by the batteries, and would not in any way have furthered the siege operations.

When the canal had to be given up, the true military course would undoubtedly have been to return to Memphis and work down on the rear of Vicksburg by the line of the railway as Grant had first proposed. But public opinion in the North was strongly adverse to anything that looked like retrogression. Grant had, as yet, no special claim on public favour. His depôt at Holly Springs had been destroyed; he had had to draw back from the Yallabusha; the attack on Chickasaw Bluffs had been bloodily repelled; the canal on which he had spent a couple of months was a failure; a retreat on Memphis, however sound in strategy, would probably have been the signal for his immediate supersession. He was therefore under the political necessity of getting to the rear of Vicksburg without going to Memphis; and the attempt by the southern flank having failed, he reverted to his former idea of trying the northern. But to traverse the swamp, cross the various bayous and the Yazoo itself, in order to scale the bluffs in face of a forewarned enemy, was an acknowledged impossibility. Water carriage protected by the gunboats offered the only means; and it was determined, by opening an old channel from the Mississippi to the upper waters of the Yazoo, to establish a line of operations which would pass through Yazoo City, capture the arsenal there, and end by outflanking the most northern works at Vicksburg.

Some years before, this channel, known as the Yazoo Pass, had been the ordinary route from the north to Yazoo City; but more recently it had been blocked by a heavy embankment so as to permit a large tract of land, at a lower level, to be brought into cultivation. This embankment was now mined and blown up; the water rushed through in a torrent, flooding the lowland, and opening a passage by which the gunboats might reach the Cold Water, the most northern tributary of the Yazoo. The channel was deep enough, but narrow; the forest grew dense along its banks; and trees adroitly felled by the Confederates in a few minutes, formed an obstacle which it took several days to remove. To pass from the Mississippi to the Cold Water, distant in a straight line only ten miles, took, in the first instance, fourteen days; and before anything like an efficient force of gunboats and men was collected on the Cold Water and its banks, very nearly a month had passed away. But the route was pronounced prac-

ticable, and the forward march of the army, numbering about 30,000 men, was ordered; whilst other divisions were to operate towards the same end in the higher country east of the bluffs. It was, however, no easy matter to find boats sufficient for the transport of 30,000 men; and whilst they were being sought for, a division of 4,000 was pushed on in company with the gunboats.

The Confederates had meantime not been idle. The sympathies of the country people kept them well informed of the enemy's movements, and their familiar local knowledge enabled them to render the very difficult way almost impassable. The Cold Water falls into the Tallahatchie, but the change of name brought no change of condition. The stream was blocked by heavy logs; and a strong fort, called after the general, Fort Pemberton, at the junction of the Tallahatchie and Yallabusha, guarded the navigation of the latter for their own use, whilst it effectually stopped the advance of gunboats by the former. After nine days of continued and most exhausting labour, the Federals approached Fort Pemberton. The ground in front was overflowed, so that the troops could not advance, whilst the gunboats, held at a convenient distance and unable to mass their fire, were pounded by the heavy guns, to which their return was necessarily feeble and ineffective. Through nearly a fortnight, attempts were made and renewed to find means to attack this fort more advantageously, but no success was obtained; and at the end of that time orders were sent down for the expedition to return, it having proved impossible to obtain sufficient transport for the rest of the army.

Grant had even earlier become extremely anxious about its safety; he feared that its return might be cut off, and he caught at the idea of sending it relief by threading a course through the labyrinthine maze of waters to the westward of the Yazoo. It was proposed that the gunboats, entering the mouth of that river should presently diverge to the left, and passing from bayou to creek, and from creek to fork, come out into the Sunflower, a considerable affluent of the Yazoo at a point far above the torpedoes and obstructions which had proved so fatal to Sherman. Rear-Admiral Porter, in command of the flotilla, examined the proposed route, and thought it possible. With five of the river ironclads—commonly described as turtle-backs—and eight smaller vessels, he entered the river on March 14, and commenced a series of operations absolutely unparalleled in the annals of naval war.

For a few days all went well. The navigation was curiously

difficult, but careless *reconnaissances* had not warned the Confederates of what was to be tried, and the only obstacles to be overcome were those which Nature herself had put in their way. The heavy ironclads forced a passage through the tangle of vegetation, and pushed aside or broke down the smaller trunks of fallen trees; the larger were cut through with axes: the vessels were tracked round the sharp bends. By the 19th they had accomplished by far the worst part of the route; they were within half a mile of comparatively open water leading into the Sunflower; success seemed to smile upon them; once in the Sunflower their difficulties would be at an end. Suddenly, as they were tearing a passage through a dense growth of willows, the enemy announced their presence by the fire of a heavy battery which opened on the gunboats and working party. In the soft alluvial earth, the water of the bayous had dug so deep that the banks were far above even the upper decks of the ships. They were powerless to reply, except with a few light field-pieces, which were of little avail. The attack was not very brisk; probably the Confederates were in no great force; but at the same time Porter learned that they had also shown themselves in his rear, and he was apprehensive that they might effectually block up the passage both before and behind. Pent up in this unknown and tangled country, the attack of a few thousand resolute men would be utter ruin. A retreat was at once resolved on. The bayou was too narrow for the vessels to turn; but their rudders were taken off, and they moved back, stern first, zigzagging and bumping from bank to bank, without control. Every moment the position became more critical. A coal barge was sunk in the channel; a number of trees were felled across it; when their men attempted to clear the way, they were shot down by an unseen enemy; the gunboats could neither advance nor retire; Porter was on the point of abandoning them and attempting a retreat on foot, when, in the nick of time, some eight hundred men sent on by Sherman arrived to his assistance. Sherman himself, with a further reinforcement, joined him the next morning. Thus strengthened, they were able to repel the attacks of the Confederates, and to protect the working parties, but nothing more; to advance, with the country in arms, was impossible. They accordingly continued the retreat, and, after excessive toil and hardship, succeeded in getting back to the mouth of the Yazoo. But for the time the ships were disabled. 'If you could see,' wrote Porter to Farragut, 'the five ironclads that have just returned from the most remarkable expedition vessels ever started on, you would not think them very suitable for run-

‘ning any distance. They are almost to pieces; rudders gone, pipes down, every boat smashed, decks swept, and wheels broken.’*

Coincident with these attempts, another had been made on the western side of the Mississippi; the idea being to pass, by numberless creeks and bayous, a distance of two hundred miles to the Red River, and one hundred and fifty more by the Mississippi itself, back to Vicksburg. After a month’s heavy work, dredging channels and extracting stumps, by the end of March the way was pronounced practicable; but Grant had by that time formed other and simpler plans, and this very circuitous route to the Red River was not further acted on.

By an exhaustive process of reasoning, he had definitely made up his mind that the attack must be from the south, by landing below Vicksburg. The enemy’s batteries were impregnable to a front attack; and the attempts to the north had ended in failures which had narrowly escaped being disasters. He determined now to lead his army by foot, or by boat, to some convenient post on the west bank, and cross over the river. To do this, the command of the river below Vicksburg was necessary, and hitherto the Confederates were masters of the situation. After Farragut’s return to New Orleans in the preceding July, they had occupied and fortified Port Hudson, a few miles above Baton Rouge, whose topographical position bore a very close resemblance to that of Vicksburg. It stood at the inner corner of a sharp bend of the river, where the stream washed the foot of the bluffs and ran past with accelerated velocity; and, as at Vicksburg, the bluffs were crowned with heavy batteries, protected in rear by works of considerable magnitude. The stretch of river between Vicksburg and Port Hudson was thus closed to the Federal forces, afloat or ashore; the special advantage of which was, not only that the left of Vicksburg was covered, but that the navigation of the Red River was perfectly safe, and that stores of all kinds could be drawn by that channel from the western provinces. The importance of putting a stop to this traffic had been early seen. An order from the Secretary of the Navy had called Farragut’s attention to it as early as October of the previous year; but the passing Port Hudson against the very rapid current was a work not to be lightly undertaken, and just at that time Farragut’s squadron was fully employed elsewhere.

It was an easier matter to run down past Vicksburg. The Confederates had only one ship, the ‘Webb,’ and that of no

* Life of Farragut, p. 353.

great force as compared with the Federal ironclads, a couple of which would carry everything before them and be sufficient effectively to close the Red River. Ellet, the youngest of a family of engineers who had planned, built, and now commanded the ironclads, undertook to run past the batteries in one of them, the 'Queen of the West,' and did do so in broad daylight on February 2. The ship was further protected by a double thickness of bales of cotton; and though these were set on fire, the ship herself sustained no serious injury. Ellet immediately set about accomplishing his mission; the presence of an enemy on the river was unexpected and for some time unknown, and he had no difficulty in destroying large quantities of stores. On the 13th, another of the rams, the 'Indianola,' followed, but the 'Queen of the West' had already gone up the Red River, where she ran fast aground under the very guns of a battery, and was abandoned by her crew, who escaped in a small steamer they had previously captured. The Confederates presently got the 'Queen of the West' afloat, and with her and the 'Webb' went to look for the 'Indianola.' They overtook her on the 24th, a few miles below Vicksburg, and, after a sharp action, overpowered and captured her in a sinking condition; she was only just saved by being run aground. The result was thus, so far, to leave the enemy with a very important addition to their naval force, which might possibly suffice in any future operations to turn the scale in favour of the batteries. An ingenious trick of Porter's, however, at once halved their gain. He took an old barge, built her up with wood into the semblance of a monitor, 'with mud furnaces' and a smoke-stack made of pork-barrels.' A good smoky fire was lighted, and the terrible-looking craft was sent down the river. As she was sighted from Vicksburg, all the batteries opened on her with shot and shell, but, apparently uninjured, she silently pursued her way. The 'Indianola' was not yet afloat, and the officer in charge of her, seeing the supposed monitor coming down, burst her guns and set her on fire; she was still flaming, when, as if to laugh at the panic to which she had been sacrificed, the dummy took the ground in her immediate neighbourhood: the hoax stood revealed, but the 'Indianola' was destroyed.

Farragut was meantime preparing for a more decisive effort at Port Hudson. For some months past, affairs in the extreme south had not gone well with the Federals. Galveston had been taken from them on January 1; a few days later, the 'Alabama' had sunk the 'Hatteras,' almost in sight of the blockading squadron; and on the 16th the 'Oreto'—better

known, perhaps, as the 'Florida'—had run out of Mobile with a boldness that nettled the Federals extremely. The admiral would have been glad to make a dash at Port Hudson, if only as a make-weight on the other side; but ships, without troops in support, could achieve no permanent success, and he was compelled to wait till General Banks, at New Orleans, was ready. It was not till news came of the loss of the 'Queen of the West' and 'Indianola' that he could persuade Banks to stir, and then only in a half-hearted sort of way. To take the place was, however, a military operation; Farragut's special object, as he gave out in a general order, was 'to run the batteries at the least possible damage to the ships, and thereby secure an efficient force above, for the purpose of rendering such assistance as may be required by the army at Vicksburg.' Banks undertook to co-operate with 12,000 men, rather to make a diversion in his favour than with any definite hope of any further result, though holding himself in readiness 'to follow up the chances upon the enemy's position.'

It was the night of March 14 when the attack was actually made. The force under Farragut consisted of two screw corvettes of the first class, the 'Hartford' and 'Richmond'; one of the second class, the 'Monongahela,' quite new; and the 'Mississippi,' an old paddle-wheel steamer; all of wood and unarmoured. Five mortar boats, an armed steamer, and an ironclad gunboat were stationed some distance down the river, to support the attack, but not to run the batteries. The three corvettes had each a gunboat lashed on the port side, as well for the protection of the gunboat herself, as to assist the larger vessel in case she should be disabled. And so, shortly after dark they got under way. The Confederates, however, were fully prepared for them: they lit up the river with large reflecting lamps on their own side and a huge bonfire on the opposite point, and their fire was accurate and sustained. Farragut's flagship, the 'Hartford,' which led, succeeded, though with difficulty, in getting round the point: but of the others, a shot disabled the 'Richmond's' boiler, and, the gunboat not being able to tow her against the current, she drifted down below the batteries: the 'Monongahela' took the ground, and suffered heavily; she was got off, but her engines were injured and would not work; so she also drifted back: the 'Mississippi' had nearly reached the point, when she too stuck fast: all efforts to get her afloat were fruitless; the enemy's shot were searching her through and through; she was therefore set on fire and abandoned. Of the whole squadron, the 'Hartford' and her attendant gunboat, the

‘Albatross,’ were the only two that succeeded in getting past; and they, principally, it would seem, in consequence of being the first, and having thus less smoke and a clear course.

It was some time before Farragut knew what had happened to the others: even two days afterwards, he wrote to the Secretary of the Navy, from the mouth of the Red River: ‘It becomes my duty to report disaster to my fleet, although I know neither the extent nor the attendant circumstances.’ This feeling of disaster made him still more anxious about the responsibility of forcing the passage, which he had taken on himself. The Comte de Paris says: ‘The instructions sent to Banks and Farragut ordered them to attack Port Hudson and endeavour to reduce it while Grant was operating against Vicksburg.’ This, however, is not quite accurate. The orders were by no means so explicit as the Comte de Paris has described them; and although they desired him ‘to guard the lower part of the river, especially where it is joined by the Red River,’ no mention was made of Port Hudson, which, indeed, was unknown at Washington when the orders were written, nearly six months before. Farragut himself certainly felt doubtful how his action would be interpreted, and he wrote somewhat deprecatingly:—

‘If, in this effort to come up and cut off the enemy’s supplies from Red River and recapture the “Indianola,” misfortune has befallen some of our vessels, I can only plead my zeal to serve my country, and the chances of war; and I felt that my orders of October 2, 1862, fully justified me in doing what I should have done two months ago but for the disasters of Galveston and Sabine Pass, the strong force of the enemy at Mobile, and the inadequacy of my force to meet all these contingencies.’ *

In fact, however, he had no necessity to excuse himself: the success had not been so thorough as he had wished or intended, but it was sufficient to close the Red River as a channel of supplies to the Confederates at Vicksburg; and Porter, on his return from the Yazoo expedition, wrote to him: ‘It will be an object for you to remain at Red River as long as possible, and I hope you will do so. It is death to these people: they get all their grub from there.’ So at the mouth of the Red River, or between that and Vicksburg, Farragut remained with the ‘Hartford’ and her gunboat. In Porter’s absence, the older Ellet, left in command, undertook to reinforce him with a couple of the ironclads, the ‘Lancaster’ and ‘Switzerland;’ but they were delayed in starting, so that

it was clear daylight before they were abreast of the batteries; and, with singular imprudence, he had neglected to protect them with bales of cotton. The result was that the 'Lancaster' was sunk; but the 'Switzerland' got down, though with two shot-holes in her boilers.

Grant's first idea, on understanding Farragut's success, was to detach 20,000 men to co-operate with Banks and reduce Port Hudson; and indeed, for some time afterwards, it remained, apparently, an open question whether Vicksburg or Port Hudson should be the first object of attack. In either case, however, it was desirable to have a sufficiency of shipping below Vicksburg; and on Grant's suggestion Porter agreed to run the batteries with the greater part of his squadron, consisting of six ironclad gunboats and three transports: these last were protected with bales of wet hay: and some, at least, of the gunboats had barks of timber lashed alongside at the waterline. At nine o'clock, on the evening of April 16, the signal was made to weigh, and the squadron slipped gently down, the 'Benton,' with Porter's flag, leading. She had passed the first batteries before she was discovered from the shore: large fires were instantly kindled on the bluffs; and on the point opposite to the town, where the Federals had control, some daring fellows set fire to some wooden houses, which lit up the dark waters and the ships of the enemy. The current, however, was running strong, and the gunboats, going at full speed, were clear of the batteries within half an hour: the damage they sustained was but slight, and nothing more than the artificers in the army could repair. The serious loss was limited to the transports: two of them turned back; but a gunboat, stationed in the rear expressly to whip up stragglers, compelled them to turn again; so that all they gained by the evolution was being a double time under fire. This was fatal to one of them, which a chance shell set on fire and entirely consumed.

The Federals were now completely masters of the river between Vicksburg and Port Hudson, with the exception of Grand Gulf, a position somewhat similar to the others, and where some batteries had been erected, which might have developed into a formidable obstacle; but Grant, having massed his troops at New Carthage, and lower down at Hard Times, crossed over to Bruinsburg in force, met the Confederates near Port Gibson, defeated them, and crossed the Bayou Pierre. Grand Gulf, which was not defended in the rear, was no longer tenable, and the Confederates hastily evacuated it.

It was just at this very critical period in the fortunes of the

South, that Grierson, the commandant of the Federal cavalry, led a force of 1,700 men and one battery through the State of Mississippi. It was a brilliant raid, and met with signal success. The orders under which he acted were simply to destroy the railways, telegraphs, and stores, so far as was practicable: all the details were left to his own ingenuity and the exigencies of the moment; and with this semi-independent commission, he started from the neighbourhood of Memphis on April 17, traversed Mississippi from north to south, and reached Baton Rouge on May 2, the day after Grant's victory at Port Gibson. And he had very thoroughly carried out his orders. More especially had he wrecked the 'Southern Railway,' the line running east from Vicksburg and Jackson to join the 'Mobile and Ohio' at Meridian, and constituting the main source of supply for the Confederates, since the Red River had been blockaded. It was more than a week before the communication could be reopened; a stoppage which at that particular time entailed the most fatal consequences.

The skirmish at Port Gibson, trifling as it was, was the turning-point of the campaign. Once having possession of Grand Gulf, Grant was able to ferry over his men and stores without let or hindrance. Grand Gulf became his base; but for the first time in this war, he resolved to give up his line of communication, and to throw himself at random, as it were, into the enemy's country. His men could carry five days' provisions; the resources of the country and a system of requisitions must supply the rest: but quickness and independence of movement was to be everything. The details of the campaign must be guided by circumstances, and his intelligence was very meagre; but he had learned that the Confederates were divided between Vicksburg and Jackson, forty-four miles apart by rail. He proposed, then, to insert himself between their divisions; defeat or drive back that at Jackson; and, turning to the west, defeat and shut the other up in Vicksburg, which he would then invest.

In war especially, the *divide et impera* is the soundest of maxims; and of the Federal generals none realised its truth more thoroughly than Grant: on the part of the Confederates of the South, it was physically and mentally ignored. In the early part of the preceding year General Johnston had commanded in chief the Confederate army before Richmond, and had been severely wounded at Fair Oaks, June 1, 1862. He was barely recovered in December, when Mr. Davis, the President of the Confederacy, appointed him to the supreme command of all the forces west of the Alleghany mountains.

But, at the same time, says the Comte de Paris, 'whether ' from an excessive anxiety about his health, or more probably ' out of regard for his own favourite, Bragg, he directed ' Johnston to station himself at Chattanooga, and exercise ' only a general and distant control over the armies in the ' field.' His province was thus rather to advise than to command, and, being in feeble health, he wanted the vigour and energy which might have enabled him to control subordinates whose position was so imperfectly defined. His first training was as an officer of engineers, but he had afterwards served in the cavalry; added to which he had the experience of the campaign on the Chickahominy in the conduct of a great army and concerted action. He could thus look on the war as a whole, and on the defence of Vicksburg as a part; he could see that the first object was to prevent the Federal army obtaining a hold on the country: if it did, the fall of Vicksburg or any other post was a necessary consequence: when the State was attacked, the true defence of the river forts was in the field; and as soon as he heard of the battle of Port Gibson, and of the Federal success on the left bank, he wrote to Pemberton: 'If Grant crosses, unite all your troops to beat ' him: success will give back what was abandoned to win it.' This, however, Pemberton was unwilling to do. He also was an engineer; but he was nothing more, and of actual war he had no experience whatever. The planning and constructing the works at Vicksburg had been entrusted to him. The fortress was the child of his skill; and its safety was, he had persuaded himself, the first thing to be considered: it was not so much a means to an end as the very end itself. He therefore, in effect, refused to obey Johnston's order to concentrate his forces before giving the enemy battle. He thought, and he appears to have been upheld by Mr. Davis, that he, on the spot, was better able to judge than Johnston at a distance; and he was convinced that Grant would be unable to support his troops for a lengthened campaign. Mr. Greene, himself a soldier, broaches the remarkable opinion that Pemberton was warranted in preferring his own judgment to that of the commander-in-chief; a view which is not only repugnant to all ideas of military discipline, but was directly falsified by the result. With sounder criticism the Comte de Paris remarks: 'If Pemberton had acted on Johnston's opinion, the ' result of the campaign might have been very different.'

The aggregate of the forces under Pemberton's command was as nearly as possible equal to that of Grant's army; each was, in round numbers, 50,000 men. But in the early days of

May, Grant had not been able to bring to the left bank of the river more than about 40,000, whilst Pemberton's 50,000 were all within easy reach, scattered along the forty miles of railroad between Jackson and Vicksburg. There would have been no difficulty in concentrating them: if this had been done, Grant might probably have been defeated, and in the position he was in defeat must have been destruction. As it was, the Federals, pushing on in a north and north-eastern direction, fell on a party of their enemy at Raymond on May 12, and drove it back to Jackson with heavy loss. It was the introduction of the wedge, and though the numbers engaged were comparatively small, they illustrate the careless and ignorant manner in which Pemberton opened the campaign. According to Mr. Greene, who refers to official reports, the Confederates had 3,000 men engaged; the Federals began the attack with about 6,000, and were presently reinforced by about as many more.

When too late, Johnston had been ordered to hasten to Jackson and to take on himself the active command. He arrived there on May 13, when the town was already threatened, and all the men that he could muster for its defence amounted to barely 11,000. Pemberton, with some 30,000, was at Edward's Station, about halfway on the road to Vicksburg, and wrote to him that Grant's army lay to the south and was preparing to attack him. Johnston immediately sent him orders to march towards the east, on the northern side of the line, and join him near Clinton, some six miles west of Jackson. He was, however, unable to perform his own part of the movement; for Grant, anticipating his intention, had already given orders for his several army corps to concentrate in the direction of Jackson. This was done on the evening of the 13th, and Johnston, finding himself tremendously outnumbered, and without a defensive position, at once made up his mind to evacuate the town. He succeeded in doing so during the night and the next day without any very heavy loss, notwithstanding the difficulties to which Pemberton's faulty disposition and false intelligence had exposed him, and Grant occupied the town on the evening of May 14.

On leaving Jackson, Johnston retreated nearly due north to Canton, where he hoped to be joined by Pemberton, who must, as he supposed, be driven in that direction by the force of the enemy between him and Clinton. Pemberton, however, had no intention of going either north or east. Johnston's order reached him on the morning of the 14th; it was perfectly clear and explicit; but instead of obeying it, he sum-

moned a council of war to decide what he ought to do. The majority were for promptly obeying the order; the minority were in favour of a movement to the south, threatening Grant's rear and the line of communication which they had not yet learned he had dispensed with. Pemberton himself would have preferred remaining at Edward's Station, but decided to act on the opinion of the minority, which, apparently to his mind, represented the middle course of prudence and safety. 'Although averse to both opinions,' Johnston wrote, 'General Pemberton adopted that of the minority of his council, and determined to execute a movement which he disapproved, which his council of war opposed, and which was in violation of the orders of his commander.' He was, however, in no hurry to move, and did not start till the following afternoon, when, by the heavy rain of the 14th, the streams were so swollen as to be impassable. He was thus continually headed back towards the east and north, and, having kept his men afoot till midnight, bivouacked at a distance of only five miles from Edward's Station.

By an intercepted or treacherous messenger, Grant had meantime been acquainted with Johnston's orders, on which he naturally concluded Pemberton would act; and he had consequently hastened to occupy a position between Edward's Station and Clinton. When, therefore, on the 16th, Pemberton at last consented to obey Johnston's repeated order, and countermarched his troops towards the north, they came almost immediately into collision with Grant's. Some partial skirmishes gradually became serious; the Confederates were able to occupy a rising ground known as Champion's Hill, and defended it stoutly, but they were outnumbered in the proportion of nearly two to one,* and were driven back with a loss—in killed, wounded, and taken—of nearly 4,000 men and twenty-four guns. As they fled from Champion's Hill, the Big Black River lay before them. It had been intended to defend it as an outpost of Vicksburg, but the works were not completed, and there was now no time. A part of the army got safely across; but a division of 6,000 men, pressed to the southward, was cut off, although eventually, after making a long round, it succeeded in joining Johnston. Another division of 5,000 men, placed to defend the approach to the Railway Bridge, proved unequal to the task. The men were cowed, and the position was weak; they gave way at once

* The numbers actually engaged are stated as about 32,000 with Grant, and 17,000 with Pemberton.

and fled, throwing away their weapons as they ran. It was what Mr. Greene calls 'a complete stampede,' in which they lost eighteen guns and 1,700 men taken prisoners. The bridge, however, was set on fire; it had been prepared with loose cotton and turpentine, so that it blazed up fiercely and effectually checked the pursuit, whilst the routed army sought safety in Vicksburg, though for the time being it was utterly disorganised.

From the banks of the Big Black, Pemberton had written to Johnston that Haines' Bluff, the extreme north of the Vicksburg lines, was no longer tenable. By noon of the 18th he received Johnston's reply: 'If Haines' Bluff,' it ran, 'is untenable, Vicksburg is of no value and cannot be held. If you are invested in Vicksburg, you must ultimately surrender. Under such circumstances, instead of losing both troops and place, we must, if possible, save the troops. If it is not too late, evacuate Vicksburg and its dependencies, and march to the north-east.' At such a message Pemberton stood aghast. To evacuate Vicksburg, to sacrifice all the stores and munitions of war, to lose the control of the river, above all, to give up his darling fortifications—it was more than he could bring himself to do. Mr. Greene again thinks that much might be said on both sides. We cannot agree with him; we cannot admit that anything can be said on the side of a soldier who disobeys a positive order, more especially when the result proved that the order was sound. The only excuse for Pemberton's conduct in this instance is, that the order came too late; his council declared that in the exhausted and depressed state of the troops, the attempt to move them was out of the question; and before they had regained their wonted courage, they were fast hemmed in by the Federal forces. Before ten Haines' Bluff was evacuated, and in such haste that the guns were left unspiked, the carriages unburnt. From Chickasaw Bluff, too, the troops were withdrawn, and Sherman, extending the right wing over the scene of his winter's disaster, reopened communication with the river; and for the next two months the Federal army drew its daily supplies from a dépôt established on the banks of the Chickasaw Bayou.

A prominent feature in Grant's tactics was not to give a beaten enemy time to recover; the crossing of the Big Black had delayed him, but he was so convinced of the utter prostration of the garrison that he did not hesitate to storm their lines as soon as he was fairly before them. This was on the 19th. He was, however, repelled, and the success did more than even rest to revive the spirits of the defenders; so that when, three

days later, Grant renewed his attempt on a larger scale and with greater determination, it was again repelled, and with very heavy loss. It was then that Grant, admitting the works were too strong to be taken by a rush, resolved on a siege in form; and at the same time that he broke ground, he summoned to his assistance all the troops over which he had control. The end was thenceforward merely a matter of time. Before the end of June, Grant had in front of Vicksburg a force of more than 70,000 men and 250 guns. Pemberton, within the lines, with an aggregate of over 30,000 men, had never more than about 20,000 fit for duty: Even these had lost all confidence in their General. They had sufficient intelligence to form some idea of the mistakes he had made, and with the independent and unrestrained spirit of troops but half-disciplined, they had no scruples about letting their opinion be known. They were in no humour to endure sufferings in a cause which they felt had been thrown away, and when provisions failed they simply ordered their general to surrender. The letter which has been recently found amongst Pemberton's papers, too late, it would appear, for the use of the Comte de Paris, is given at length by Mr. Greene. When we remember what, in much greater straits, men have endured, some of its sentences are sufficient to prove that Pemberton had neither their confidence, their love, nor their respect.

'Our rations have been cut down to one biscuit and a small bit of bacon per day, not enough scarcely to keep soul and body together, much less to stand the hardships we are called upon to stand. . . . Men don't want to starve and don't intend to, but they call upon you for justice, if the Commissary Department can give it; if it can't, you must adopt some means to relieve us very soon. . . . If you can't feed us, you had better surrender us, horrible as the idea is, than suffer this noble army to disgrace themselves by desertion. I tell you plainly, men are not going to lie here and perish: if they do love their country, self-preservation is the first law of nature, and hunger will compel a man to do almost anything. . . . This army is now ripe for mutiny unless it can be fed.'

Accordingly on July 4, Pemberton surrendered, virtually, if not nominally, at discretion; his men became prisoners of war, and all stores were given over. The success was even more decided than Grant had supposed, and he could scarcely conceal his astonishment when he learned, by the demand for rations, that the captured garrison numbered more than 32,000. It would thus appear certain that Vicksburg might have been saved if Johnston had been given the requisite power in time, if Pemberton had not been guilty of gross dis-

obedience, and if Mr. Davis had not supported him in it. There were nearly 50,000 men in the immediate neighbourhood; there were 30,000 more in Arkansas, which might have been called up; whilst from the east, troops might have been spared—the whole of Longstreet's command might have been spared—which would have given the Confederates on the Mississippi an overwhelming advantage. But when once Pemberton, with a beaten and disorganised army, was driven back into Vicksburg, whilst Johnston with some 20,000 men—many of them raw levies—was held in check to the northward, and Grant was massing his thousands for the siege, the fate of the fortress was sealed, the loss of the Mississippi was accomplished.

With Vicksburg, Port Hudson also fell; it had been shut up for some weeks, and capitulated as soon as the news from Vicksburg was confirmed. And now, looking back on the course of events, we can see that more almost than on any one point in the struggle, did the result of the war hang on the fate of Vicksburg. By its loss, not only were the States of the North-West confirmed in their allegiance to the Union, but the isolation of the Confederacy was completed; alike on the coast of the Atlantic, of the Gulf and the Mississippi was the blockade perfect; and the Confederates were left—to use a phrase that has since become historical—to stew in their own juice. One chance only might have still remained: if the army of Virginia had been able to drive back and crush the invaders, it is more than probable that negotiations would have followed, and the political dispute which was seeking its solution in arms might have ended in some reasonable compromise. The fortune of war willed it otherwise; and before the summer was past, the year had failed to realise that early promise of success which had been heralded on the banks of the Rappahannock.

The sanguinary repulse which the Federals had sustained at Fredericksburg disinclined them for any immediate action. Burnside had been promptly superseded by Major-General Hooker, whom his partial soldiers had loved to call 'Fighting Joe;' 'a man,' says General Doubleday, 'of fine presence, of great personal magnetism, and with the reputation of being one of our most efficient and successful corps commanders.' But the dejection of the troops in the first instance, and afterwards, the heavy and continued rains, which turned the rough country roads into impassable quagmires, prevented all further fighting for several months. It was only with the return of fine weather and the approach of May that Hooker was able to

attempt any movements against the enemy. Lee remained securely posted on the heights above Fredericksburg, which Burnside had so fatally proved to be impregnable; anything like a direct advance against him was out of the question; but Hooker was led to suppose that his left flank might be turned, and that by threatening his communications with Richmond, and Richmond itself, he would be compelled to leave the shelter of his entrenchments.

The heights of Fredericksburg, where the Confederate army lay, are on the right, or southern bank of the lower Rapahannock, a large river flowing into the Chesapeake, and itself formed, ten miles higher up, by the junction of two considerable streams, the upper Rapahannock and the Rapidan, coming from the north-west and west respectively. The Federals lay at Falmouth, almost immediately opposite, on the left bank; and the idea which gradually formed in Hooker's mind was to keep away to the right and cross the two upper streams, leaving sufficient force at Falmouth to occupy Lee's attention, until his flank should be turned. The very large force which he had at his disposal rendered this possible; his numbers were almost exactly double those with Lee;* but, though thus overwhelming, they would not necessarily continue so, for, in the first place, one of Lee's corps, absent with Longstreet, might be expected back immediately, and, in the second, great numbers of his own men, enlisted for a short term, would presently claim their discharge. Meantime, a great opportunity seemed offered him, and he waited impatiently for the finer weather to render the roads practicable. On April 15, he despatched his whole cavalry division, under Stoneman, with orders to cross the rivers, work round to Lee's rear, break up the railway and cut the telegraph wires; and this alone, he confidently expected, would be sufficient to cause Lee to retire. But as Stoneman reached the fords, a spell of wet weather set in, and the rivers became raging torrents; before they were sufficiently abated it was the 28th, the infantry was moving up, and the cavalry and the leading columns of infantry crossed at the same time.

Lee had early information that a considerable force had crossed the Rapahannock and was moving towards the Rapidan; but at the same time he saw that a large force was still opposite to him and was making a demonstration lower down the river, as though to cross there and operate against his right

* They are stated from official reports as 124,500 and 62,000 respectively.

flank. He was unable to decide what Hooker really meant to do ; and it was not till the afternoon of the 30th that the doubt was cleared up by the attitude of the enemy, and by the intelligence that four out of seven army corps had crossed the Rapidan. But for Lee, and more especially when Jackson was with him, to understand and to act were the same thing. The troops immediately received orders to march towards the enemy, who was by this time gathered in a singularly rugged and difficult tract of country known as the Wilderness. Here had formerly been a number of iron-workings, by which the ground had been curiously broken ; the trees had been cut down for the furnaces, and had been succeeded by a dense growth of dwarf oaks, thorn and juniper, laced together by creepers, so as to be in many places quite impenetrable. Through this ran, in a nearly east and west direction, the turnpike road from Fredericksburg to Orange ; whilst a number of smaller roads, often mere tracks, wandered and wound as though in a maze ; the clearings were few and of very limited extent ; the houses were mostly roadside taverns ; at the largest, known from the name of its proprietor as Chancellorsville, Hooker established his head-quarters on the afternoon of the 30th.

There had already been several skirmishes between small detachments of cavalry ; but the Confederates had no force sufficient to oppose any immediate advance which Hooker might have ordered ; there being, indeed, only one brigade, under Anderson, on the road leading east : this would have been at once swept away, when the Federals could have occupied the heights to the west of Lee's position, threatening his rear, and commanding all the fords of the Rapahannock. Hooker, however, was impressed with the idea that Lee's sole resource was to retreat on Richmond ; he hoped that he would do that, and had argued that he must do it, exposing his flank and rear to a concerted attack of the whole Federal army. He accordingly waited at Chancellorsville through the evening and night ; nor did he prepare to advance the next morning till near noon. But through the whole night Anderson had been hard at work throwing up a line of entrenchments ; during the forenoon he was largely reinforced, Jackson himself coming up about eight o'clock and taking the command. It thus promised to be a very serious thing for the Federals to force their way out of the Wilderness, the heads of their columns being strictly limited to the breadth of the roads, only two of which were available. In attempting this some severe fighting took place. The Federal writers think that they were on the point of succeeding, and the Comte de Paris accepts their

view; but Hooker at the time either judged differently or placed no value on the movement; and, much to the disgust of the officers engaged, sent them a peremptory order to fall back. The position which he held within the Wilderness was easily secured and almost impregnable; and it is probable enough, as General Doubleday suggests, that ‘Hooker thought if Lee ‘assailed a superior force in an entrenched position he would ‘certainly be beaten, and if he did not attack he would be forced ‘to fall back towards Richmond for food and ammunition.’

Lee, however, had no intention of shattering his army against impregnable lines of defence, which in such a country were made in a few minutes. He spent the afternoon in examining what was before him: the Federal left, now reinforced by a sixth army corps, under Major-General Meade, was thrown back and rested on the river; the rest of their army lay on a line east and west corresponding to the high road; but no weak spot was to be found. He was in doubt what to do, when at early dawn Stuart brought him word that the enemy’s right was ‘in the air,’ resting on nothing and quite exposed. Jackson, who was with him at the time, immediately suggested that by making a circuit through the woods he might fall unexpectedly on this right flank; he offered to try it with his own corps, numbering about 26,000 muskets. Lee sanctioned the proposal; during the whole day he distracted the enemy’s attention by furious and frequent cannonades against his left; and meantime Jackson was pressing west by a route hidden in the wood. He was indeed partly seen, and Hooker, who had been warned of the unprotected position of the extreme right, sent repeated instructions to Howard, who commanded there, directing him to take precautions against a possible attack. But he more than half believed that the reported movement was the commencement of the retreat he had been waiting for, and he was careful not to check it; whilst Howard utterly ridiculed the idea of being attacked, and received with very scant courtesy those officers who suggested measures of prudence.

And thus, about six o’clock in the evening, whilst the Federal soldiers were cooking their supper, playing cards, or lying listlessly about, with their arms piled at some little distance—wagons, baggage-mules and cattle intermixed—Jackson burst in on them. Two companies had been thrown out as pickets; the pickets, the deer, the wild turkeys, and the Confederate troops came on them all together; few, very few, were under arms, and those were drawn up fronting south, whilst the attack came from the west; there was scarcely a

pretence at resistance, and they fled. A considerable part of this corps happened to be Germans, and for the time it soothed American pride to attribute the panic and the rout to the German regiments. Nothing could be more untrue or more unjust. The Germans, like the rest, were caught unprepared, were rolled up and put to flight almost before they had time to know what had happened. The best troops in the world would have fared no better, for the men had no power of defending themselves. 'They were driven into a huddle,' says General Doubleday, 'and a huddle cannot fight.' No such disaster had befallen a great army since Frederick II. of Prussia had rolled up the Austrians at Leuthen in 1757; and the Comte de Paris in reviewing the circumstances attributes the blame as much to the general who had not discovered the turning movement of the enemy as to the commander of the corps who allowed himself to be caught in such an unfavourable position.

Jackson's men continued their advance; the wild rush of the panic-stricken fugitives across the clearing of Chancellorsville was the first intimation that Hooker had of the dire calamity which had befallen him. He himself was like one in a dream. The enemy were fast approaching the clearing, which once gained, the whole army would be swept away, when Pleasonton, who commanded the cavalry, got some light guns hastily drawn up to oppose them. They would have been over these before they were ready but for the devoted charge of Major Keenan and his regiment of cavalry, the 8th Pennsylvanian. The regiment was cut to pieces, Keenan fell with his comrades, but time was gained; and as the victors came on they were received with a storm of grape from twenty-two guns which first staggered and then stopped them. It was now dark, they could not see the weakness of the force opposed to them; they could not see Pleasonton threatening the artillerymen with his sword to keep them to their guns; and they imagined the obstacle more serious than it was, though it rapidly became as formidable as they imagined it.

The advance through the wood and their very success had thrown the Confederates into disorder; and when stopped it was impossible at once to get them in hand again. All that could be done was to strengthen such positions as they occupied, and to keep a vigilant look-out. In arranging for this, Jackson himself and some of his staff rode forward to examine the ground. It was about ten o'clock and very dark. They were returning hastily when their own watch, mistaking them for a party of the enemy's cavalry, fired a volley of

musketry into them at a distance of twenty yards. Almost every horse and man in the party was killed or wounded. Jackson himself was struck by three bullets; one broke the left arm near the shoulder, and cut the artery; he fell into the arms of his aide-de-camp, the only one who was not hit, and was with difficulty supported into the lines. He lingered for eight days, and died on May 10. And thus in the hour of victory, by a trivial accident more fatal to the Confederate cause than the loss of a battle, fell Lieutenant-General Thomas Jackson, whose steadfastness at a moment of extreme peril early won for him, from friends and foes, the distinguishing name of 'Stonewall;' the most remarkable and brilliant soldier of modern times, 'a brave and pure man with great abilities.' *

But though the Federals had succeeded in staying the onslaught of the enemy, all idea of further aggression was, for the time, thoroughly thrashed out of them. When morning came, they had their wings thrown back towards the north, at right angles to their front, so that their army was formed on, roughly speaking, three sides of a square, and clearly for defence rather than for attack. On the west, they were assailed by Stuart, who had succeeded Jackson in command of the left; on the east, by Lee in person. But though the fighting was severe, the Confederates were exhausted, their great leader was lying mortally wounded, the glow which he had kindled was cold. On the other side, towards three o'clock in the afternoon, a post against which Hooker was leaning was struck by a cannon-shot; he fell heavily to the ground, partially stunned. The concussion seems to have affected his brain, for from that time he gave no further orders; no one else felt authorised to take the command, and the battle was waged independently by the various corps. By the evening they were driven back nearly a mile to the northward, till their formation became something of a horseshoe, the wings resting on the river; and there they stood. The pressure had, in fact, been taken off them; for about the same time that Hooker was wounded, Lee received intelligence which called his attention elsewhere.

Major-General Sedgwick, who had been left at Falmouth, found his command gradually dwindled down to one army corps, or about twenty thousand men; all the rest had been called across the river to Hooker. His instructions were to cross lower down and make a demonstration as if towards Richmond;

* This is the private testimony of an enemy, the entry in Admiral Dahlgren's diary. *Memoir of John A. Dahlgren* (8vo, 1882), p. 391.

but other and later orders directed him to see if any impression could be made on the old Confederate position above Fredericksburg. On the morning of May 3, he ascended these blood-stained heights, then held by only a couple of slender battalions, numbering about eight hundred men, who were eventually surrounded and made prisoners, at the cost of one thousand killed or wounded. From thence he advanced, purposing to fall on the rear of the Confederates, but was checked by part of their right wing thrown back, and the next morning, whilst Stuart was left to restrain Hooker's army of nearly four times his numerical force, the whole Confederate right was turned against Sedgwick and pressed him in towards the river. His position was one of extreme difficulty. He had no definite orders, no intelligence from Hooker; he did not know what force was opposed to him, and was led to suppose that the Confederates had received large reinforcements, and that he was much outnumbered. In reality, Lee had about twenty-three thousand against his twenty thousand; but the effective difference at such a time was very much what Sedgwick believed it to be. He accordingly made up his mind to recross the river as soon as darkness permitted him; and in the exhausted state of the Confederates, after four days' hard fighting, he was able to do so without any serious hindrance.

Hooker had also determined to withdraw to the north bank; but on the 5th the weather broke, heavy rain rendered the roads excessively difficult, and submerged the ends of the bridges. To lengthen them was the work of several hours, an embarrassment that might have been fatal. But the same difficulties that delayed the Federals' retreat delayed also the Confederates' advance. Lee, having disposed of Sedgwick, was anxious to crush Hooker, but was prevented by the continual rain; and during the night of the 5th and early morning of the 6th the Federals accomplished the passage of the river without hindrance from the enemy, and on the 7th they returned to their old quarters near Falmouth; the sole result of the week's campaign having been the loss, in killed, wounded, and missing, of more than seventeen thousand men. The loss of the Confederates, too, had been very severe, and both armies were in need of rest and reinforcements—the Federal army more especially, which by the action of the short-term system was further reduced by thirty thousand men; and time was needed to get the new levies into their place. But shortly after their return to Fredericksburg, the Confederates were joined by Longstreet with the whole of his corps; and new drafts brought up the army to nearly eighty thousand men—most of them now old soldiers,

confident in themselves and their general, and with a certain degree of contempt for their enemies. Lee was not the man to keep such a force idle in cantonments. He was thoroughly well aware that, when possible, attack is the best defence; but the particular form of the attack was dictated by economical and political, rather than military considerations.

The resources of the Southern States had been already most severely tried. The blockade of the sea coasts and the river had cut short the supply of food; the cotton they could not sell was no substitute for the corn they could not buy, and dire famine prevailed everywhere. It was with the greatest difficulty that the armies could be fed even on short allowance. This want made it in itself desirable to levy subsistence from the enemy and to maintain the army by requisitions; but more even than this did the political circumstances suggest the advisability of transferring the war to the enemy's country. Washington might possibly be captured; even a serious demonstration against it would spread confusion through the Northern States, in most of which there was a strong party in favour of the Confederacy. It was believed that a successful invasion might shake the Union even in the North; it was hoped that it might bring about a recognition by some of the European powers; and it seemed probable that it might force the Government at Washington to treat on some mutually acceptable basis. The news from Vicksburg, too, was alarming. Mr. Davis and all who were in his confidence were quite well aware that they were powerless to relieve the place; and that when Pemberton was shut in, its fall was merely a question of time: success in the North might compensate for the approaching disaster in the West. All these and other considerations combined to represent an invasion of the North as necessary; it was determined to undertake it; and, once resolved on, Lee put his army in motion on June 3. Hooker, suspecting his adversary's intention, wished to counteract it by threatening Richmond. Washington, he felt sure, could defend itself, whilst the danger to Richmond would call Lee back, too late, perhaps, to save it. Mr. Lincoln, however, would not hear of such a scheme; public opinion was too delicate to stand so great a strain as the immediate presence of the Southern army before Washington; and Hooker received positive orders to leave Richmond to itself, and attend on the movements of Lee.

Lee had resolved on moving north by the valley of the Shenandoah, and, sending in advance the corps commanded by Lieutenant-General Ewell, followed it across the Blue Mountains. Ewell pushed rapidly on, surprised, and, after a trifling

resistance, made himself master of Winchester, capturing the greater part of the garrison, to the number of about 4,000. This was on June 15; and meantime, Jenkins's brigade of cavalry, 2,000 strong, was sent forward. It crossed the Potomac on the 14th, and for the next few days was master of the granaries and the herds of the Cumberland Valley. Jenkins proved himself thoroughly equal to the duty imposed on him. He exacted and collected an enormous quantity of stores—horses, cattle, forage, provisions, medicines—wherever they were to be had; and though he went through the form of paying for what he took, it was in Confederate scrip, which, according to General Doubleday, 'was not worth ten cents a bushel,' so that there was but little consolation in receiving it. The farmers would have fled if they could, but the raid had come on them too suddenly; they comforted themselves by imagining and relating the worst possible stories of Jenkins. That there was some harshness is probable; that the requisitions fell heavy on many poor and worthy people may be admitted—it is the sad necessity of war; but it appears certain that discipline was strictly preserved, that no plundering, or straggling, or drunkenness was allowed, and the statement that a number of free negroes were seized and sent south to be sold is, in itself, exceedingly improbable, and rests on no trustworthy evidence. Whilst Jenkins was foraging, Ellwell with the infantry of the corps was pushing on. On June 27, he was at Carlisle, and on the 28th some detached parties had stretched as far as Harrisburg. The Pennsylvania Militia had been called out, some 100,000 men had been mustered, but they were quite untrained, there were no rifles available for them, and, with the exception of some few with fowling-pieces, they were unarmed. Harrisburg was thus quite incapable of defence, and appeared already within Ellwell's grasp, when, on the evening of the 28th, he received an order from Lee to rejoin him without delay; the Federal army had crossed the Potomac, and was threatening his communications.

Lee had learnt this suddenly and unexpectedly, for the main force of his cavalry, under Stuart—which he believed was covering his right and keeping him informed of the enemy's movements—had gone off on a brilliant and adventurous, but singularly ill-timed, raid. How it happened that Stuart thus went away from his post, was much discussed at the time; and the Comte de Paris, examining the several statements, concludes that the orders to Stuart were not given with the necessary precision, and permitted him to think that by the rear of the Federal army, against which he was directed to operate if

opportunity offered, Lee meant the rear as opposed to himself, whereas he meant the rear when in column on the march. Whether this was so or not, the fact remains unaltered, that, having got to the east of the Federal army, Stuart, as he attempted to cross in front of it, was continually headed off towards the north-east, so that he was not only unable to re-join Lee, but, after the first two or three days, no longer knew where he was, and continued absolutely without intelligence of him till he reached Carlisle on July 1. Lee had meantime got by accident, on June 28, the news which ought to have been brought him by his cavalry two days earlier, and had hastily sent out orders for his army to concentrate on Gettysburg, a small town of no note in itself, but possessing the curious strategical importance of being the meeting-point of almost every road in the county. Of turnpikes and country roads leading into it, there are no less than twelve marked on the map, in addition to a branch-railway connecting it with Baltimore and Harrisburg. It was thus pointed out to Lee as the natural place on which to concentrate, whether for defensive or offensive operations.

Hooker's intentions, as manifested by his actual movements, had been such as to compel Lee to this concentration; but Hooker was no longer commander-in-chief of the Federal army. After a series of differences with Halleck as to the conduct of the campaign, he had sent in his resignation on the 27th. It had been promptly accepted, and Major-General Meade appointed in his place. Meade had been originally an engineer officer, but had retired from the army for some years before the war. He is described as a man having the appearance of a student rather than of a soldier—pale, bent, and wearing spectacles; but he had served with credit on the Rapahannock, and had commanded the rearguard at the retreat across the river after Chancellorsville. Still, there was some speculation as to why he was selected, for Reynolds and Slocum, both commanding army corps, were senior to him and better known. That he was a personal friend of Halleck's was no doubt a principal cause; and the fact that not having been born in the States (although the son of American parents) he could not be a candidate for the presidency, was probably not without weight in the centre of political intrigue and jobbery.

When Meade took the command, the Federal army, numbering nearly 105,000 men of all arms, was concentrating at Frederick, a small town about forty miles due south of Gettysburg, and commanding the valley of the Monocacy and the passes of the South Mountains through which Hooker had

threatened Lee's communications. Meade preferred rather to frustrate the enemy's immediate aims, whether they might be against Harrisburg or Baltimore. The cavalry reconnaissance conducted by Pleasonton and, under him, by Buford, showed him that Harrisburg was in no immediate danger; he did not, however, realise that Harrisburg had been saved only by Hooker's demonstration against the Confederate rear, and concluded that Baltimore was the object in view. In order therefore to cover Baltimore, Meade proposed to occupy a position on the line of Pipe Creek, a stream which runs past Taneytown in a south-westerly direction and falls into the Monocacy; but whilst waiting for more definite intelligence, he extended his army somewhat to the north, with the understanding that any corps encountering the enemy was to fight in retreating on the pre-arranged position; and thus, on June 30, two of the army corps were at Taneytown, two others at or near Emmetsburg, and Buford with two brigades of cavalry had pushed on to Gettysburg. On arriving there late in the evening, he learned that the Confederates in force were marching in that direction from the westward; and in opposition to Meade's intention, or in ignorance of it, conceived that his immediate duty was to check the enemy's advance so far as lay in his power. A ridge of low hills on the west of the town appeared to offer suitable positions; he accordingly occupied it with his small force, and sent off word to Reynolds, who commanded at Emmetsburg, and to Meade himself.

The advance of the Confederates was thus certain to bring them into collision with Buford's men, but on neither side was there any thought of the magnitude of impending events. Probably in the whole of the two armies Buford was the only man who had formed any idea of it, and he only partially. Reynolds may also perhaps have speculated to himself on the possibilities, but he had not spoken of them to his immediate subordinates, who were so quietly ignorant of what was going on that, on the following morning—July 1—Wadsworth, commanding a division under Reynolds, sent Major Kress, an officer of his staff, into Gettysburg to see if it was possible to get a supply of shoes for some of his men. Buford met him in front of the inn about nine o'clock, and asked, 'What are you doing here, Sir?' Kress explained, and Buford told him he had better return immediately to his command. 'Why, General,' said Kress, 'what's the matter?' At that moment the distant sound of a single gun was heard: 'That's the matter,' replied Buford, as he mounted his horse and galloped off. On the other side, also, the Confederates had no know-

ledge of any enemy being in their immediate neighbourhood ; and when they found their advance contested, believed for some time it was merely by a body of local militia. But their whole army was following, and the two brigades with Buford were in a fair way to be overpowered, when Reynolds arrived with strong reinforcements. Still the Federals were quite outnumbered ; and though neither Lee nor Meade had any idea of the magnitude of the combat which was growing on them, almost at haphazard, the Confederates, already marching on the place, took part in the action as they came up, whilst the Federals had to be summoned from points ten or twenty or even thirty miles distant, and the numbers that arrived were in comparison limited.

Reynolds was shot through the head very shortly after coming on the ground ; but the fight for the western hills was stoutly maintained till towards evening, when the Confederates, with a rush, carried the position, and drove its defenders down pell-mell, across the lowland, and up another and steeper hill to the south of the town, known then and to all time as the Cemetery Hill. It appeared afterwards that, as yet, no force of any importance was gathered there, and that if the pursuers had pressed on they might have won this hill also with the greatest ease. But of this Lee was altogether ignorant. Owing to Stuart's continued absence, he was utterly in the dark as to the enemy's movements and positions, and, from the daring and resolute way in which the western ridge had been held, was inclined to think that he had stumbled unawares on the whole Federal army, and that, at five in the evening, it was too late to bring on a general action, for which he was, at the moment, quite unprepared. But by this time the several corps of the Federal army were all marching on Gettysburg ; as they came up they occupied the Cemetery Hill and the ridge extending from it, and by next morning, July 2, an assault on their position promised to be a much more serious affair.

Cemetery Hill is the northern end and meeting-point of two low but rugged and irregular ridges, one of which runs a little to the west of south for nearly three miles and ends in two successive peaks known as Little Round Top and Round Top ; the other runs to the south-east, and stops somewhat abruptly in the rugged height of Culp's Hill. The whole position, from Little Round Top, on the south-west, round by Cemetery Hill, to Culp's Hill, on the south-east, had thus a horseshoe form, affording ready means of intercommunication and of strengthening any one part on

which pressure might fall. As, with daylight, Lee had a fuller knowledge of what was before him, he doubted the advisability of renewing the battle. He had fairly accurate information of the strength of the Federal army, which exceeded that of his own by from ten to twenty thousand men; and might well hesitate about attacking a superior force in entrenchments which each hour made more formidable. The alternatives which presented themselves to Lee's mind were to stay where he was, and receive Meade's attack, or to draw back to the range of the South Mountains. His actual position was weak, and offered few compensating advantages. In the passes of the South Mountains, on the other hand, positions almost impregnable might easily be found, where his line of communication, or, if necessary, of retreat, would be secure, and where Meade would be driven, by force of public opinion, to attack him. There seems no doubt that Lee himself strongly inclined to the opinion that this would be the more correct course to follow; that Longstreet agreed with him; and that he was influenced, against his better judgment, by the feeling which he found to exist amongst the younger officers and throughout the army. To them, the idea of retiring before the army of the Potomac seemed as absurd as it would be disgraceful: was it not the same army which they had driven back at Fredericksburg, or which they had chased before them, with the deer and turkeys, through the woods of Chancellorsville? They believed themselves invincible, and would act as if they were; but though such a belief, in the lower ranks of an army, is a powerful element of success, it is dangerous when it takes possession of the superior officers. The military genius of Lee or of Longstreet could see the advantage of retiring to the South Mountains; but even they probably thought such caution would be excessive in respect of the enemy whom they had so often defeated. It has, however, been further suggested that it was open to Lee to draw the Federals out of their position by turning their flank on the south and threatening Baltimore. The idea seems an after-thought, arising out of a desire to convict Lee of a mistake in which the army at large was not implicated; but it has apparently been overlooked that Gettysburg was not a position of Meade's choice: he was there almost by accident, and would have fallen back on Pipe Creek without hesitation and without a pang. It is possible that, from some of the prisoners, Lee had learned something of Meade's intentions; but, in any case, there is no evidence that he admitted such a demonstration against Baltimore as a possible alternative; he:

accepted the decision of his army, and determined to fight out the quarrel on the ground that chance had chosen.

The principal attack was ordered to be made against the enemy's extreme left: it was entrusted to Longstreet, supported by Hill, whilst Ewell was to threaten, or, if opportunity offered, to assault the Cemetery Hill and the enemy's right. The Comte de Paris believes that on this occasion Longstreet was not in accord with Lee, that he did not agree with him as to the probable advantage of the turning movement, was unwilling to accept any responsibility, and delayed the attack till late in the afternoon, when he at last received positive orders to begin. We think that in this he has done Longstreet less than justice, and that the cause of the delay was the want of ammunition. But whatever was the meaning or the cause, it was nearly four o'clock before the struggle really began. There was no surprise, as there had been at Chancellorsville; nor was the flank turned; and the fighting was extremely severe. It was seen that Little Round Top was the key to the position: if the Confederates could have once obtained that and held it, with a few guns they would have swept the ridge; at times they almost succeeded in winning it, but were eventually repulsed. Further north the contest was no less severe. From their outlying positions the Federals were driven back and up the slope. Twice the crest was won by the assailants, but could not be held against the numerical odds that were brought up to support the strain: the Federal right was unduly weakened; Culp's Hill was left almost undefended; and late in the evening, Ewell succeeded in establishing a division on its summit. When darkness put an end to the fighting, though no definite success had been obtained, the results were, on the whole, favourable to the Confederates, and encouraged Lee to renew the attack the next day. Meade, on the contrary, was extremely anxious, and proposed a retreat. This has been denied. The Federals, after their final success, have been unwilling to admit it, and have maintained that nothing more was intended than a prudent degree of preparation; and this is the view adopted by the Comte de Paris. But General Doubleday, who speaks from personal knowledge, considers that Meade went far beyond this. What he says is:—

‘ At night a council of war was held, in which it was unanimously voted to stay and fight it out. Meade was displeased with the result, and although he acquiesced in the decision, he said angrily, “ Have it your own way, gentlemen, but Gettysburg is no place to fight a battle in.” The fact that a portion of the enemy actually prolonged our

line on the right [Culp's Hill], and that our centre had been pierced during the day, made him feel far from confident. He thought it better to retreat with what he had than run the risk of losing all.'

On a further consideration of the subject he says again: 'There can be no question that, at the council, Meade did desire to retreat;' and he now inclines to think that under the circumstances the retreat would not have been wrong, for the army had suffered terribly during the two preceding days, so that it was quite possible the enemy might still win some great success; whereas, having fired away all their ammunition, and being also much weakened, they were too exhausted to pursue. The Federal army would soon have been recruited to its former numbers, whilst day by day the Confederate army was wasting away. We are, however, led to suppose that at the council he voted for standing fast. 'Hancock,' he adds, 'in giving his vote, said the army of the Potomac had retreated too often, and he was in favour of remaining now to fight it out.'

So the next morning the fighting was renewed, and the Federals, by an overwhelming effort, recovered the summit of Culp's Hill. But Longstreet still held the advanced positions won on the previous evening. Lee himself visited these, to see if they could be further utilised. General Woffard, commanding a brigade under Longstreet, told him that he had nearly reached the crest the evening before. In a recent letter, quoted by General Doubleday, he has related the conversation. 'Lee asked if I could not go there now. I replied, "No, General, I think not." He said quickly, "Why not?" "Because," I said, "General, the enemy have had all night to entrench and reinforce." I had been pursuing a broken enemy, and the situation was now very different.' Having convinced himself that on this flank nothing more could be done just then, Lee resolved to attack the left centre, on the north-west side of the height. If this should be successful, the enemy must be driven off the ridge to the south; if towards Emmetsburg, Longstreet would have them on the flank; if towards Taneytown and Pipe Creek, Stuart, who had rejoined the evening before, was now extended in that direction and completely commanded the road. In either case, the retreat could not but be disastrous.

The division commanded by General Pickett was still intact. Though part of Longstreet's corps, it had not come up till late in the previous evening, and had not yet been engaged. It was composed almost entirely of Virginia regiments, veteran soldiers, proud of their country and their army. Pickett him-

self had a few years before been known, and not favourably known in England, as the officer whose violent and overbearing conduct at San Juan Island had threatened to overcloud the relations between this country and the States. A man apparently unfitted by temperament and by training for the diplomatic conduct of business, as a soldier he was above reproach; and the gallant manner in which he led the attack against Cemetery Hill, the no less gallant manner in which he was followed, called forth the admiration of enemies as well as of friends. Even General Doubleday says, 'The rebels came on magnificently;' and the Comte de Paris, with a touch of enthusiasm, tells how 'marching with measured step and well-dressed line, Pickett's division, firm and silent, moved forward in magnificent order.' After a furious cannonade on both sides, they advanced to the assault. The whole force consisted of about 14,000 men, but the brunt of the fighting fell on Pickett's division, about 4,800 strong. The other brigades followed in support; but in ascending the hill they diverged, so that the weight of the attack was dissipated. The flanks of the assaulting column were left uncovered; and when, after sustaining a murderous fire, they reached the crest, they found themselves isolated. Attacked by immensely superior numbers in front and in flank, they fell by hundreds.

'The division,' says the Comte de Paris, 'did not give way; it was annihilated. The flags, which but a few minutes before boldly waved over the enemy's trenches, sank one by one to the earth, to be raised again only by the victors. Some, not daring to cross for the second time the space swept by the enemy's fire, laid down their arms: many trying to regain their own lines were shot by the way. Of the 4,800 men who followed Pickett, not more than 1,300 got back under cover of the Southern guns: 3,500 men were sacrificed, and twelve flags were lost, in this fatal charge.'

Amongst the superior officers, unwilling to accept defeat, or to fly from an enemy they had scorned, the loss was exceptionally heavy; of four generals and eighteen field officers, Pickett himself and one lieutenant-colonel alone escaped unhurt. General Doubleday, who had been personally engaged in the early part of the struggle, but was merely a witness of the close, hastened to send out stretcher-bearers to bring in the wounded. 'I was told,' he writes, 'that there was one man amongst these whose conversation seemed to indicate that he was a general officer. I sent to ascertain his rank, but he replied: "Tell General Doubleday in a few minutes I shall be where there is no rank." He expired soon after, and I never learned his name.' The supporting brigades were not engaged so closely,

but their loss was still severe; and the shock to the whole army was so great that Lee was apprehensive that an attack in force on his lines would be utter ruin. The artillery, however, kept up a bold front, and opened furiously on the Federal position.

It seems now generally admitted by all that if Meade had at once given orders to advance, he must have obtained decisive success. His whole army expected such orders, but they never came. He was a man constitutionally cautious; on his appointment to the command, General Doubleday wrote: 'He had never achieved any brilliant success or met with any serious reverse.' His caution saved him from the one and stopped him from the other. But on the present occasion it is possible that he was the best judge. He knew that his own losses were enormous, and though he had reason to believe that those of the enemy were quite as heavy,* his experience on the banks of the Rapahannock had taught him that the attack of an army commanded by Lee and behind its own defences was not a matter lightly to be undertaken by weary men. Nor had he any conviction of the reality of his success. Even the following morning, one of the corps commanders, who had just left him, said to General Doubleday, 'Meade says he thinks he can hold out for part of another day here, if they attack him.' Lee meantime had resolved on retreat. He was virtually unopposed, for Meade's only desire seems to have been to get him out of the country. He crossed the Potomac on July 14, and by the end of the month had taken up a position at Culpepper between the Rapahannock and the Rapidan, from the neighbourhood of which he had started less than eight weeks before.

It has of late years been very much the custom to speak of Gettysburg as the decisive battle of the war. The magnitude, the duration, and the unparalleled severity of the struggle have given it perhaps a greater repute than it is altogether entitled to. Undoubtedly it was a heavy blow to the fortunes of the South; but as the invasion of the North was dictated by political rather than by military considerations, so also were the effects of the failure political rather than military. It had been hoped by some signal success to retrieve the disaster at

* They were in fact, as nearly as possible, the same: the Comte de Paris estimates them as being, on each side, in killed, wounded, and missing, 23,000 out of an effective total, actually engaged, of about 84,000 Federals and 69,000 Confederates. The killed or mortally wounded he estimates at about 4,000 on each side.

Vicksburg; the cruel irony of fate ordered the retreat of Lee to begin on the very day that Vicksburg surrendered. It had been hoped that the malcontents of the North would have the opportunity to assert their sympathy with the Secession; when too late to be of any service, the sympathy took the form of riots in some of the Northern towns, which were severely repressed. It had been hoped that the Powers of Europe might at last recognise the struggling Confederacy; the campaign did not convince them that the time had yet come. The surrender of Vicksburg and of Port Hudson completed the isolation of the South; the repulse at Gettysburg confirmed it. It is in this sense that Gettysburg may be considered the decisive as it was the most terrible battle of the most sanguinary of modern wars.

ART. IX.—*Correspondence of the Earl of Aberdeen. 1850–1853.*

Privately printed, not published. 8vo. 1880.

A BIOGRAPHY of George Gordon, fourth Earl of Aberdeen, who filled in the course of forty years many of the highest offices in the State, would embrace the most important political transactions, both at home and abroad, which marked the first half of the nineteenth century, for in all of them he played a considerable part. Although Lord Aberdeen never occupied the conspicuous position of a party leader in the House of Commons, and did not possess those gifts of oratory which catch the popular ear, the gravity of his character, his vast experience, and his entire sincerity placed him in the first rank of British statesmen, both in the House of Lords and in the Cabinet. Connected as he was in early life with the High Tory party, he long entertained opinions, and advocated on some questions a course of policy, to which the writers of this Journal were and are opposed. But it is the more remarkable and the more characteristic of the perfect honesty and candour of his nature, that in the later years of his life he not only accepted the changes brought about by the constitutional measure of 1831, but he moved onwards with a firm and unhesitating step in the path of progress and reform. When many of his political friends could discern nothing but destruction and ruin in the expansion of institutions which they cherished, Lord Aberdeen saw in these changes the signs of the times, and nothing ever shook his courageous confidence in the temper and will of the English people. He

was the firmest supporter in the Cabinet of those measures of Sir Robert Peel which have given a lasting fame to that administration, although they led to the disruption of the Tory party; and he became, after the death of that great minister, the stoutest champion of religious toleration, of free trade, and of the policy of peace. To no man can the words of Horace,

‘Integer vitæ scelerisque purus,’

be more fitly applied. He lived up to a high standard of conscientious duty; and even those who differed from the views he entertained on some political questions, and who would willingly have infused into his government a more energetic spirit of action, could not fail to recognise in his motives and his character a noble example of public and of private virtue.

No such biography, however, exists, or, as far as we know, is in contemplation. But his papers and correspondence, which were placed by his will in the hands of his younger son, Sir Arthur Gordon, have been carefully arranged; and these documents present, under his own hand, a complete record of the more important transactions of his life. Sir James Graham wrote to Mr. Gordon, soon after his father's death, in the following terms:—

‘Your father's history is best recorded in his own writings. His letters, both public and private, are an exact image of his mind; they are clear, simple, and forcible from their honesty, admirable as compositions, and ample in their details. They will speak for themselves better than any other voice or pen. They embrace every subject, foreign and domestic, of the last half-century. His correspondents, both at home and abroad, were the greatest and the ablest men of their day; and there is no historical subject of interest during this eventful period, on which light might not be thrown by a judicious selection from your father's papers.’

We are permitted to make a partial use of this correspondence, some fragments of which may without impropriety be submitted to the public; and as it is impossible within our limits to range over the incidents of forty or fifty years, we have selected for notice on the present occasion a very small but interesting portion of it, relating to the transactions that occurred between the death of Sir Robert Peel in 1850 and the formation of the Cabinet over which Lord Aberdeen presided in 1853. The minute study of politics resolves itself very much into a study of character; and in the following pages we shall aim not so much at the record of any stirring events as at the examination of the motives and intentions of

the men by whose action events are in some degree governed. There comes a time when politics pass into the domain of history. The interests and passions which are touched by the incidents of the day have long been extinct; but the conduct of statesmen in the difficult conjunctures of public life has an undying interest to those who look upon politics as the great school of life and character. These precedents and examples are the landmarks of duty. It is possible that to the present generation the fate of the Peelite party and the particulars of their alliance with the Whigs may have less interest than the crisis had to ourselves who were more directly concerned in it; but the honourable means by which that alliance was effected, the just and liberal conduct of Lord Aberdeen, and the success which crowned his efforts, are memorable transactions, which may serve as a lesson and an example in future times. The correspondence now before us for the first time explains this passage in our constitutional history.

It is remarkable that the lives of Lord Aberdeen and Lord Palmerston, who were regarded for many years as the representatives of two systems of foreign policy widely opposed to each other, started from the same point, and ran in precisely parallel lines. Both of them were born in 1784; both of them were educated at Harrow* and at Cambridge; Lord Palmerston entered the House of Commons in 1807, Lord Aberdeen entered the House of Lords, as a representative peer of Scotland, in the same year; both of them were supporters of the Duke of Portland's Administration and of the party then in power; both of them were, in fact, statesmen of the school of Mr. Pitt. The divergence of their views occurred at a much later period, but even then the direction they followed was not altogether dissimilar. Lord Palmerston shared the fortunes of the friends of Mr. Canning, and, after the short administration and death of that minister, approximated to the Whigs; Lord Aberdeen from the year 1835 cordially adopted the Liberal-Conservatism of Sir Robert Peel, more especially the principles of religious toleration and commercial freedom; and after the death of his great friend and leader in 1850 he found himself placed by the force of circumstances at the head of that small band of eminent

* Their contentions began in the schoolboy pranks of their youth. An old Harrovian relates that Henry Temple occupied a room in his tutor's house, within that of the young Scotch earl. On one occasion, during a tussle, he was barred in and his candle blown out: after a short delay the voice of the prisoner was heard through the keyhole in the words, 'Lighten our darkness, we beseech thee, O Lord!' Lord Aberdeen succeeded his grandfather in the earldom in 1801.

statesmen whom the Tory party had repudiated to cast itself under the guidance of Lord Derby, Mr. Disraeli, and the tattered flag of the Protectionists. The 'Peelites,' as they were called, consisted—it is well to enumerate them—of Lord Aberdeen, Sir James Graham, the Duke of Newcastle, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and Mr. Cardwell, who had all held high office under Sir Robert Peel. The Conservatives in the House of Commons who had followed Sir Robert Peel and voted the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, had dwindled in number from a hundred and seventeen to about fifty; some had fallen back to their old party allegiance; some had lost their seats; but this small remaining fraction consisted of men of high character and ability—the very cream and marrow of Sir Robert Peel's majority. The army had lost its officers, and the officers were without an army. What then was to be the ultimate position of this important section of our parliamentary forces and our political life? That was the problem. No one supposed that a small intermediate party could long maintain an independent existence in the British House of Commons; such a position was fatal to its own political prospects and injurious to the nation. Which side then would exercise the most powerful attraction over it? Would the breach be closed between the remnant of the Tory party and their former chiefs? or would the identity of opinion existing between those chiefs and the leaders of the Whig party on the principal questions of the day bring about a closer connexion with the Liberal Administration? The answer to these perplexing questions depended partly on individual opinions and character, partly on circumstances. All were agreed that an uncompromising defence of the commercial and financial system of Sir Robert Peel was never to be abandoned; and as long as the Tories remained Protectionists reconciliation was impossible. To this were added some personal considerations. The growing influence of Mr. Disraeli over the Tory party, and the rancour with which he had assailed their illustrious chief, caused him to be regarded with intense aversion by the followers of Sir Robert Peel. Mr. Disraeli was an insurmountable barrier, and although Lord Derby, on more than one occasion, made overtures of reconciliation, they were not accepted.

The difficulty of the situation was increased by the gravity of the events occurring in Europe and the extreme weakness of the Government at home. The years which elapsed between 1846 and the death of Sir Robert Peel had witnessed the fall of constitutional monarchy in France and a series of revolutionary convulsions in every part of the Continent. Within

the Cabinet, as is now well known, the action of Lord Palmerston in France, in Italy, in Hungary, and in Greece, was regarded with the greatest anxiety by his colleagues and by the Sovereign. Ireland was on the brink of civil war, which was averted by the energy and prudence of Lord Clarendon. Even London had its 10th of April. But meanwhile the Ministry dragged on a feeble existence, supported by very small majorities, and subsisting less by its inherent strength than by the dread of what might succeed it.

The state of the Continent and the foreign relations of this country, which were always watched with the deepest interest by Lord Aberdeen, were held in suspense by the gradual advance of Louis Napoleon to supreme power, and the uncertainty which prevailed as to the use he might make of it. We are strongly tempted by the terse and inimitable letters of Princess Lieven to her old English friend, and by the firm and prescient sketches of passing events which were supplied to him by M. Guizot, to trace in some detail this remarkable passage in history. They viewed it from different sides. The Russian Princess, delighted to be relieved from her republican panic, hailed with pleasure the establishment of a military autocracy. M. Guizot, steadfast in his attachment to constitutional monarchy, and naturally inclined to optimism, confidently predicted the ultimate fall of the Imperial rule, though, like many others, he failed to calculate the duration of it. Lord Aberdeen invariably retained his abhorrence of a despotism established by violence and fraud, and never relinquished his distrust of a sovereign who shared so largely in the character of an adventurer, and who inherited the tradition of the Bonapartes. Thus he wrote on December 9, 1851:—

‘The French news has not surprised me in the least, for I have always known, and said, that the President would avail himself of the first opportunity to assume supreme power. His whole conduct rendered this manifest. Should he succeed, as seems likely in the first instance at least, he will not be satisfied without the Empire. If they elect him President for the year, as he proposes, we shall have him Emperor before the end of the first year. He has played his cards well and boldly; but I cannot think his success will be permanent.’

And a few days later to Sir James Graham:—

‘To give the fellow his due, he has done the business dexterously enough, even more effectually perhaps than his uncle could have done; but it has been by more consummate hypocrisy and falsehood, by which success has been rendered less difficult.’

Princess Lieven of course took exactly the opposite view of the *coup d'état* of Napoleon. She wrote :—

‘ Je vois en lui l'instrument dont Dieu a voulu se servir pour le salut de la société ; il est en grand chemin de le faire. Il n'a pas une autre pensée ; laissez-moi vous raconter un dialogue entre lui et Montalembert, vendredi le 5, après la bataille. Ils ne s'étaient pas vus depuis le coup d'état. J'ai vu Montalembert ce même vendredi au soir :—

‘ “ Que dois-je penser, Monseigneur, de ce que vous venez de faire ? Quel est votre but en le faisant ? ”

‘ “ J'ai une mission à remplir, tuer le socialisme et le journalisme.”

‘ “ La religion, Monseigneur, qu'a-t-elle à attendre de vous ? ”

‘ “ Je suis de la religion du pape ; je saurai la maintenir et la défendre.”

‘ “ Et vos idées politiques, Monseigneur ? ”

‘ “ Elles se résument en ceci. Si en 1789 j'avais eu l'honneur d'être soldat de la garde française, j'aurais donné ma vie pour défendre Louis XVI et Marie-Antoinette.”

‘ Ce que je vous redis là est textuel.’

But this part of the correspondence would lead us too far from our principal purpose, which lies within the four corners of the realm, and relates to the private interchange of opinions between a few individuals. Amongst them Lord Aberdeen was pre-eminent. The death of Sir Robert Peel on July 2, 1850, immediately after the last great speech he delivered in the debate on the Greek claims, in answer to the last great speech Lord Palmerston made as Foreign Minister (for his fall from that office was not remote), had deprived his friends of their illustrious leader, and thrown still greater uncertainty on their future course. The task of guiding them devolved on Lord Aberdeen. No one felt that melancholy event more acutely than Lord Aberdeen. On July 5 he wrote to Princess Lieven :—

‘ A great light has disappeared from amongst us. Never did I know such universal grief exhibited by every description of persons ; high and low, rich and poor, from the Queen to the common labourer, all feel alike. And with good reason, for his services were equally rendered to all. After so long an intimacy, exceeding half a century, you may easily imagine what a loss I have sustained in being deprived of such a friend. But Europe will feel this loss. The name of Peel was connected with a wise, safe, and moderate policy, and inspired confidence in every quarter. His last speech in Parliament, delivered only the day before the fatal accident which has taken him from us, fully proved his adherence to the soundest principles of our foreign policy.’

If there was one man more than another in whom the tradi-

tions of this 'wise, safe, and moderate policy' survived Sir Robert Peel, and who enjoyed the entire confidence of his sovereign and the most liberal and accomplished members of the Conservative party, it was Lord Aberdeen.

On February 5, 1851, Lord Londonderry wrote to him:—

'I feel very confident, from all that has passed, and from the very high eulogium he (Sir James Graham) passed upon you, that you have much power to weld the scattered fragments into some consolidated shape, and the sooner this can be effected the better for the country. Graham said distinctly that, since Peel's death, you are the only man he really looked up to in political life, and he was unaffectedly sincere in his declaration.'

But in the autumn of 1850 an incident occurred, which placed a fresh barrier between Lord Aberdeen and his friends and the principal members of the existing administration. In September the Pope had promulgated a Bull to re-establish in the kingdom of England, according to the common law of the Church, a hierarchy of bishops deriving their titles from their own sees; and Dr. Wiseman, assuming the title of Archbishop of Westminster, had announced in a pastoral letter that 'Catholic England has been restored to its place in the ecclesiastical firmament, from which its light had long vanished.' These measures, and the language in which they were couched, excited a violent and, as the result has proved, an exaggerated ferment in the country. Lord John Russell, either sharing this emotion, or willing to profit by a popular movement, addressed (without the knowledge of his colleagues) a letter to the Bishop of Durham in which he denounced the Papal aggression as 'insolent and insidious;' and although this retort was strongly disapproved by many of his own colleagues and by not a few members of the Liberal party, a Bill was introduced on the opening of Parliament in February, 1851, to prevent by a penal enactment the assumption of certain ecclesiastical titles in respect of places in the United Kingdom. In the fervent heat of the moment this Bill was carried by large majorities, although, as is well known, it has since proved altogether inoperative, and was repealed in 1871. The most important and unfortunate effect of the Bill was that it placed Lord Aberdeen and his friends in direct opposition to Lord John Russell and the majority of both Houses, for they opposed it, one and all, with the greatest energy; they argued that it was a gratuitous interference with the principles of religious toleration and a base compliance with a popular delusion. Never was the resistance of a very small minority of patriotic men conducted with greater spirit,

or more entirely justified by subsequent events.* Within a few days their consistency was put to the test. Ministers were defeated on their financial measures, and on February 21 Lord John Russell resigned. What followed is thus related by Lord Aberdeen to Princess Lieven on February 27 :—

‘ After the resignation of Lord John and his whole Cabinet on Saturday morning, the Queen sent for Stanley, who told her that he was not prepared at that moment to undertake the formation of a Government; but that if other combinations were attempted and should fail, he would then endeavour to perform the task rather than leave the Queen without a Government. The Queen sent for Lord John again, and also for me and Graham. We met at the palace, and after a long interview it was decided that Lord John should try to form a Government by a junction with Peel’s friends and the best of his own. The next day, however, convinced Graham and myself that we could not conscientiously agree to the “No Popery” measure which Lord John proposed, and which the Parliament appeared to sanction. The negotiation was in consequence brought at once to an end, and Lord John resigned his commission. The Queen then sent for me and wished me to undertake the formation of a Government. You will readily believe that I was not sorry to have such a reason for declining to do so as was afforded me by the relation in which I stood to the Popery question, and the certainty of defeat in the House of Commons upon this subject. The next morning the Queen sent for Stanley again, and he is now engaged to form a Government. His prospect of success is gloomy enough. Canning has refused the Foreign Office, and Gladstone has declined to enter his Cabinet. Whether he will persevere, and endeavour to produce something like an administration, or give up the attempt altogether, I really cannot say. Ridicule will attend him in either case.’

The result is well known. Lord Stanley did not persevere, but on that occasion gave up the task as hopeless, though he resumed it a few months later. But the transaction is memorable, as the first attempt which was made to unite the Whig Ministers with the friends of Sir R. Peel. The exact terms of the alliance were set forth in a memorandum of Lord John Russell, which has never been published. They were as follows :—

1. The present commercial policy to be inviolably maintained.

* The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was ultimately carried in the House of Commons, in a mitigated form, by 263 votes to 49. It passed the House of Lords, July 29, 1851, by a large majority, but Lord Aberdeen recorded an able and elaborate protest against the measure as inconsistent with justice and expediency. (See Thorold Rogers, ‘Protests of the Lords,’ vol. iii. p. 377.)

2. The financial measures of the year to be open to revision.

3. The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill to be persevered in so far as the preamble and the first clause, only.

4. Notice to be given of a Bill to extend the right of voting in England and Wales: this Bill to be brought in after Easter.

5. A commission of enquiry into corrupt practices at elections to be issued.

To the first two points Lord Aberdeen and Sir James Graham cordially assented. But their objection to the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill remained undiminished: they remarked that the proposed reduction of the measure would only render it more inoperative, and consequently less acceptable to its supporters, though equally offensive to the Roman Catholics. They thought the introduction of a Reform Bill 'after Easter' hasty and premature, though not objecting to the principle of such extension if safeguards could be provided, which would preserve the balance of the Constitution, and which would strengthen and not impair the existing form of government. This terminated the negotiation, but Lord John Russell declared that he did not intend to submit a single name to her Majesty without the previous assent of Lord Aberdeen and Sir James Graham, and that he meant the most entire and full confidence in them both in forming and carrying on the Government.

Soon after these occurrences the following remarkable letter was addressed by the King of the Belgians to Lord Aberdeen:—

'Lacken: March 12, 1851.

'My dear Lord Aberdeen,—It is a very long time that I have not written to you, though I often think of you, and though I am most desirous of not being forgot by you.

'England has just gone through a very long ministerial crisis; all I most heartily wish is, that when it is finally to be concluded, it may give you again a share in the Government, and thereby the means of exercising a most desirable and beneficial influence on the affairs of Europe.

'I still think with dismay of your letter by which you inform me of the breaking up of Sir Robert Peel's administration; then was the beginning of those awful events which not only nearly upset all the Governments of Europe, but even civilised society itself. Some of the Governments have, it must be confessed, shown great energy, and Austria must, in that respect, receive the greatest praise; it saved most of the other States.

'The revolutionary spirit which exists on the Continent is not one that can be discussed with, and which would admit of compromise, and then become an element of the political existence of the State; its aim

is not reform but destruction, for its own profit and even amusement. Such a spirit can only be met and checked by real strength, by actual power in its greatest development. There also is the dearest and truest English interest. The danger comes from France, and however low that country seems to be at present, it ought not to be underrated; there are the most dangerous elements if once let loose. To meet them you must rely on the strongest possible organisation of Germany, and this cannot be the case if the two great powers, Austria and Prussia, do not act together.

‘Time does not allow me to develop these questions to-day, but if you should like to have my opinions I am ready to state them.

‘Believe me, with sentiments of the highest esteem and truest regard, ever, my dear Lord Aberdeen,

‘Yours most faithfully,

‘LEOPOLD R.’*

There are various indications that if the combination of the Whigs and the Peelites had taken place in February 1851, Lord Palmerston would not have been invited to retain the Foreign Office, though Lord Aberdeen and his friends took no formal exception to him, as Lord Grey had done in 1845. But the Pacifico affair, the proposed reception of Kossuth at Broadlands, which was only prevented by the Cabinet, the strong remonstrance of the Queen in a Minute which amounted to a reprimand, and various other circumstances, had rendered the continuance of Lord Palmerston in office as Foreign Minister quite as unwelcome to his own colleagues as it was to the Court and to the Opposition. The approval of the *coup d'état* which he expressed to Count Walewski was the occasion, perhaps the pretext, for a step which had long been contemplated by the Prime Minister. On December 17 Lord John Russell

* Although not immediately connected with the subject before us, it may be well to record here an important statement which we find in a letter from Sir J. Graham to Lord Aberdeen on the causes which led to the dissolution of Sir R. Peel's Ministry in 1845. Sir Robert Peel did not at that time propose to his Cabinet the repeal or abandonment of the Corn Laws, but the suspension of them in consequence of the Irish famine. The real question was whether this suspension should be temporary or otherwise; Sir James Graham writes: ‘After Lord John's failure to form a Government [in December 1845], when we returned to office, Stanley would have consented to a suspension of the Corn Laws, if Peel would have pledged himself to reimpose them when the suspension ceased. The question was not brought to an issue until then; and Stanley seceded, not because Peel proposed repeal, but because Stanley insisted on a pledge to reimpose them after a fixed period, in circumstances which could not be foreseen.’ This is a very curious fact, which has not, as far as we know, before been explained and disclosed.

advised the dismissal of Lord Palmerston from the office he had held so long. The real cause of the dismissal of Lord Palmerston (added to many of his previous acts) was the speech made by him on November 18 in answer to addresses from the inhabitants of Finsbury and Islington which contained expressions highly offensive to foreign Powers, and his reply was scarcely less unbecoming a Foreign Minister. The Queen strongly disapproved this language, and a correspondence followed, in terms of considerable asperity, between Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston, the existence of which was only known to her Majesty and to the Duke of Bedford. The Queen was advised, however, not to demand the dismissal of the minister, but to wait until Lord John Russell proposed it to her; and this was what actually took place. The subsequent incident of the approval of the *coup d'état* by Lord Palmerston was the ostensible cause of his dismissal, but the measure was already contemplated as inevitable. These transactions were wholly unknown to the other ministers, who were not aware for what purpose the Cabinet was summoned to meet on December 17. Lord John Russell requested Lord Granville not to attend that Cabinet, evidently because he intended him to be Lord Palmerston's successor, as in fact he was. On January 6, 1852, Lord Aberdeen wrote as follows to the Duke of Argyll:—

‘Lord John’s *coup d'état* is not likely to prove as successful as that of the President. It has been much too long delayed. He had half a dozen better opportunities of striking the blow than that which he has at last adopted. But the cup was full, and I suppose the least drop was sufficient to make it overflow. It is singular that Palmerston, who has been the “bottle-holder” of all democratic movements and the enemy of absolute governments, should have so enthusiastically supported the establishment of an unmitigated military despotism. This was, no doubt, a grave offence, and it may be convenient to assign no other cause for his expulsion; but the truth is that our relations with the whole world are in a state quite unprecedented, and which could no longer be continued. It is not the demand of any foreign Government, but the knowledge of this fact, arising from a policy of passion, personality, and hatred, which has led to the change. I like Granville’s appointment. He is sufficiently liberal; but at the same time he is mild and conciliatory, and I have no doubt will do well. I am at a loss to conjecture what course Palmerston will pursue. Both Radicals and Protectionists appear equally confident that he will join their ranks; but the only thing certain is that he will do whatever may afford him the most efficient means of hostilities against Lord John.’

This last prediction was speedily verified. Parliament met on February 3; on the 9th Lord John Russell brought in his

Reform Bill, lowering the household franchise in boroughs from 10*l.* to 5*l.*; on the 20th the Government was defeated by Lord Palmerston on a Militia Bill, and at once resigned. Lord Derby then proceeded to make the attempt which he had abandoned as hopeless in the previous year, and, in fact, no other government was at that moment possible. The interlude of a Tory Cabinet and a Protectionist Ministry renouncing Protection was necessary to bring together the still divergent elements of the Liberal party. Lord Aberdeen, with characteristic moderation, assumed a neutral position. In his opinion the course the Peelite party ought to pursue was a firm adherence to Peel's commercial policy, with a liberal support of the general measures of the new Government. He said as much in the House of Lords, and Lord Derby cordially replied: 'If we cannot act together, we need not unnecessarily aggravate or embitter difference.' Soon afterwards Sir James Graham wrote: 'If all men capable of governing are so bent on destroying each other that national interests and safety are as dust in the balance, the days for cripples are approaching; and we must shoulder our walking-sticks and testify some lingering regard for the public good without any intermixture of party feeling.' One difficulty, at least, was soon swept away. Mr. Disraeli produced a regular Free Trade Budget, and made such a speech as might have come from Peel himself. At all events, we shall now hear no more of Protection.' At the end of a short session Parliament was dissolved. The Government failed to obtain a majority in the new House of Commons. But the interval was marked by some transactions of great importance. On June 29, 1852, on the eve of the dissolution, Lord Aberdeen wrote to Princess Lieven:—

'If it should be found that Lord Derby will certainly be in a minority, we shall have much political negotiation with respect to his successor; for you will easily imagine that many persons hostile to the Government will not assist in their overthrow without being fully satisfied with those by whom they must be replaced. The disjointed state of parties renders a fusion extremely difficult, if not impossible; and this may greatly tend to the stability of the Government, which, although weaker than all united, will probably be much stronger than any single party. This is not a very comfortable prospect, and might lead to serious consequences; but this is a wonderful country. The wealth, activity, prosperity, and general content are unexampled, and appear to be increasing. I have no fear of democracy or of any political evils; but you know I have long thought we are destined to suffer from our religious differences. It is strange that such should be the case at this time of day, but there is more intense bigotry in England at this moment than in any other country in Europe. As usual,

in proportion as the cause of difference is trifling, the vehemence and rancour increase.'

No sooner was the result of the elections known than Lord John Russell (July 21, 1852) addressed the following overture to Lord Aberdeen. He assumed at once that the friends of Sir Robert Peel could not support Lord Derby's Administration. There remain, he said, three other courses: to stand aloof, as they had done since Sir Robert Peel's death, which would prolong a state of weakness and uncertainty; to act in friendly concert with the Whigs, preserving their own independent position; to join the Whigs, and form a fusion, either with or without Cobden. He then mentioned the course he should recommend on the meeting of Parliament, and added:

'The main point is to ascertain whether Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Sidney Herbert would be disposed, with you and the Duke of Newcastle, to concert with the Whigs the course to be adopted when Parliament meets, and I beg of you the favour to ascertain this point for me. When that is ascertained, we may consider at our leisure the merits and defects of any particular proposition. I can truly say that no pretensions of mine shall stand in the way of such a concert. I shall be quite ready, out of office, to support a Liberal Ministry, if it is found, as may be the case, that the Radicals and Irish members would be gratified by my exclusion.'

Lord John addressed a similar letter to Sir James Graham, towards whom, as an old Whig colleague in Lord Grey's Ministry, he stood in a somewhat different relation; but in this communication he intimated that although he was ready to support a Liberal Government *out of office*, he rejected as 'personal degradation' the notion of his holding any subordinate situation, in fact any office but that of Prime Minister. This pretension of Lord John was one of the principal difficulties which pervaded the whole negotiation, and very nearly wrecked it at the last moment. On the other hand, Mr. Tufnell, who as the whip of his party was the best authority, declared that a large portion of the old Whig party would not serve in a government, or even support it, if Lord John were the head, and that Lord John could not, at present, return to power as Prime Minister.

Lord Aberdeen immediately communicated Lord John's overture to the Duke of Newcastle, with an important disclosure of his own views, from which we extract the following passages:—

'We have hitherto acted so cordially together that I trust we shall continue in this course, and, as we have the same objects in view, that we shall deal with the present difficult and complicated state of public

affairs without any material difference of opinion. The late elections have thinned our ranks and deprived us of several friends whom we could ill spare, but the country must still be disposed to regard us as the representatives of Peel's policy, and as the party of Conservative progress. . . .

'I confess my own feelings towards the Government are much changed. At the time of its formation I thought that there was but one great difference between us, and that Lord Derby, in appealing to the country, was prepared to stand or fall by the result. Instead of this, I do not find that any intelligible issue has been submitted to the constituencies; and free trade and protection have been left to take their chance, according to the prevalence of local interest. The only test proposed at the elections involves a principle of religious bigotry, pregnant with mischief for the future, and more objectionable to me than protection itself.

'Altogether the conduct of the Government is quite unprecedented, and their whole proceeding is the most dishonest I have ever witnessed. From the course which has been pursued, both before and during the elections, it is clear to me that any principle will be sacrificed with the view of obtaining parliamentary support. Entertaining these opinions, I cannot look to the continuance of the present Government in power with any degree of satisfaction.

'What then is to be desired? If I could realise my own individual wishes, it would be to see Lord John at the head of a Government directed and supported, in some measure, by a portion of Peel's friends, although not in office myself. I believe that this, upon the whole, would be the most advantageous Government for the country, and would give best assurance of safe and real progress.

'I am told, however, that many of Lord John's own friends, and I know that some of ours, would not support a Government framed upon this basis, and of which he should be the head. If this be really the case, we must look for some other combination, the nature of which must, after all, in great measure, depend upon the opinions and course of Lord John himself, but of which it seems to me indispensable that he should be an essential part.

'It is clear that the hopes of the Government entirely depend on the presumed divisions of those who are opposed to them; and so long as these divisions exist the Government will be sufficiently strong to maintain their ground. It is also certain that there are many persons of all parties who will never be brought to vote against the existence of a Government without being able to form a reasonable conjecture of the consequences of that vote.

'I think, therefore, the time is come when we ought to act in cordial concert with Lord John and the Whigs. I am not aware of any real differences existing between us. Free trade, with all its legitimate consequences, is quite safe; and I do not anticipate anything but agreement on the subject of our financial policy.

'Different views may be entertained respecting education and the Church; but perhaps these are more theoretical than practical, and the necessity of mutual forbearance will be strongly felt. It is to be hoped,

after the lesson of the past year, that we shall have nothing to apprehend from any hostile interference on the part of the Whigs with religious freedom.

‘The only question that will offer much practical difficulty is Parliamentary reform. You will see the notions thrown out in his letter by Lord John upon this subject, which appear reasonable enough. I apprehend, however, that all details may be matter for impartial consideration hereafter. For myself, I must confess that I think our whole system of representation is attended with so much real corruption, whether in the shape of personal influence, intimidation, or direct venality, that I am by no means reluctant to attempt some change. I should view the ballot itself without much dread, if I did not think it calculated to increase rather than diminish the evil.*

‘The course recommended by Lord John on the meeting of Parliament seems to me perfectly judicious, and likely to be attended with success; but I presume the Government would submit to this result. Perhaps it is best that it should be so, and that Disraeli should be forced to produce his measures, and exhibit the *hocus-pocus* tricks by which he hopes to gull his supporters. It seems impossible that many should not, at last, see and resent the dishonesty of the course pursued.’

Sir James Graham and the Duke of Newcastle, who acted throughout in the most cordial union with Lord Aberdeen, expressed their entire concurrence with the views contained in this important letter. The Duke remarked in his reply that the dishonesty of the existing Government had been unprecedented; that an overture to join it would be little short of an insult; and that the resignation of Lord Derby was the first absolutely necessary step to a better state of things. But then the formidable difficulty at once arises, who is to form a Liberal Government on a comprehensive basis—or rather, who is to be its head? From various causes it was apparent that Lord John Russell could not undertake the task with the smallest chance of success. Many of his own warm and sincere friends had told the Duke that it could not be done. Lord Lansdowne

* Lord Aberdeen had devoted considerable attention to the question of the ballot, to which he was much less opposed than Lord John Russell was. He enquired of M. Guizot what had been the effects of the ballot in France, and received from that statesman a very full and satisfactory answer to his question. In this letter he says:—

‘We have hitherto entertained a great dread of the evil consequences of the ballot, but reflection does not show me that it may not exist without being productive of such effects. It certainly appears inconsistent that the electoral franchise, being in the nature of a trust for the benefit of all, should be exercised in secret, and that the parties interested should have no means of knowing how this trust has been fulfilled. The consequence of this would seem to be a tendency to the establishment of universal suffrage as the natural corrective, and thus the question arises whether universal suffrage be compatible with the existence of a constitutional and limited monarchy.’

had been suggested; but Lord Lansdowne was seventy-two years of age; he had taken a formal leave of public life when he last retired from office; and he had declined the responsibility of the Premiership when he was a much younger man. Hence the Duke concluded that 'if Lord John Russell approved of and consented to such a plan, Lord Aberdeen could best unite and consolidate the various elements which ought to be collected together in a Liberal Government;' and he summed up his opinion of the course to be pursued by the Peelites in three propositions:

1. Union with Lord Derby is impossible.
2. Isolation is pleasant, but not patriotic.
3. Co-operation with other Liberals is requisite.

To this the Duke added that in his opinion it were well that the name of *Whig* as well as *Peelite* should as far as possible be abandoned, and merged in the more general term of 'Liberals,' as the Tories had become 'Conservatives.' It was a rash proposal to un-Whig Lord John Russell, and he resented it; but time has brought about the change the Duke contemplated, and the more comprehensive term has swallowed up the old party designation. On this point of the party name the following passages are curious. Lord John replied:—

'As to the name of Whig, a name of which Mr. Pitt (as Lord Harrowby assured me) was as tenacious as Mr. Fox, it does not belong to me to give it up. If people do not continue to use that name, well and good. I shan't insist on being called a Whig rather than a Liberal. We have no Whig Club—no other use of the word than "quem vult usus." I do not see the advantage in making any formal agreement on the subject.'

Lord Aberdeen remarked to the Duke of Newcastle:—

'I have no doubt Mr. Pitt called himself a Whig—indeed I know that he did so—but be this as it may, there is no public man on whom the Tory stamp is more indelibly placed. Lord John may do what he pleases, but he will be called a Whig to the end of his life. This is a title of which some persons are proud, but which at the present day really means nothing at all. At all events, whatever it may mean, we do not become Whigs by acting with Lord John, nor does he become a Tory by acting with us. For my own part I have always repeated the lines of Pope as applicable to myself—

"In moderation placing all my glory,
The Tories call me Whig, the Whigs a Tory."

But we must return to the position of the scattered members of the Peelite party. Mr. Cardwell had just lost his seat at the recent election, to the great regret of his friends, and Mr. Sidney Herbert was abroad, but their views did not differ

materially from those of the Duke of Newcastle. A far more important and difficult question arose from the peculiar attitude of Mr. Gladstone, who was of course one of the most essential parties to the proposed combination. Mr. Gladstone was opposed to any motion for the immediate and simple displacement of the Government, which had been advocated by Sir James Graham at Carlisle. He thought that time should be given to ministers to announce their measures, and that the Peelites should by friendly intervention ward off any immediate blow. He condemned strongly the 'quackish' speeches at Aylesbury, and was not prepared to accept Mr. Disraeli as the financial organ of the Government; but he felt as strongly as ever 'that we ought not to suffer ourselves to be absorbed 'in the Liberal party.' Mr. Gladstone had just been re-elected member for the University of Oxford, on the ground, as he conceived, of friendly relations to Lord Derby; if, then, he took his stand as one of the party opposed to him, he ought as a man of honour to resign that seat. Nor did he find the road to party union with the Whigs so smooth. At the same time he complained of the shuffling of the Government on the main questions of protection and religious liberty—'shifting 'and shuffling due partly to a miserably false position and the 'giddy prominence of inferior men; partly to the (surely not 'unexpected) unscrupulousness and second motives of Mr. 'Disraeli, at once the necessity of Lord Derby and his 'curse.' On these grounds he declared that he was not free to enter into this concert in the present condition of public affairs, and that he had rather, if it were in his choice, keep a position on the Liberal side of the Conservative party than take one on the Conservative side of the Liberal party. In accordance with these views Mr. Gladstone plumped for Lord Maidstone at the Westminster election. At the same time Lord Aberdeen felt assured that Mr. Gladstone would not join Lord Derby's Government. It is clear that one insurmountable obstacle to such a reconstruction of the Conservative party was the presence and influence of Mr. Disraeli. The Peelites could never forget the savage vehemence with which he had assailed their illustrious leader; nor could they forgive the public immorality of a man who could form and lead an opposition on a certain plea, succeed, and then abandon it. These letters from Mr. Gladstone were communicated to Lord John Russell, who replied to them with a good deal of tartness; so that the breach seemed to be wider than ever. Lord Aberdeen, with his usual tact and good feeling, again played the part of mediator.

‘It is true,’ he said to Lord John, ‘that I have never known much of party bitterness myself; and so far as I am concerned these feelings have long ceased to exist :

“*Lenit albescens animos capillus.*”

I doubt not that you have yourself sometimes attributed motives to Tory opponents, which further experience has taught you to abandon. Gladstone possesses so much that is excellent and amiable in character, that you may be fully persuaded, if it should ever be your fate to act together, you will find in him nothing but frankness and cordiality.’

Meanwhile there were other combinations on foot. Lord Palmerston was not a man to let the ball lie idle at his feet, and he had his own game to play. He had not forgotten the manner of his own downfall in the preceding year, and his subsequent retaliation on Lord John. He said to Mr. Sidney Herbert

‘that his confidence in Lord John as a *leader* was quite destroyed; that his love of popularity would always lead him into scrapes, and that when a man made sudden announcements of a new policy without consulting his colleagues, one might acquiesce rather than break up a Government, when the actor was a friend, but not otherwise. He thought, therefore, that Lord John being out of the question as a leader, though he had no objection whatever to act with him under anyone else, Lord Lansdowne from his experience, character, and the known moderation of his opinions, would be more likely than anyone else to combine under his standard the Conservative Whigs and the Peelites. He said that he had proposed this plan to Lord Lansdowne, whose answer was, “Give me a majority of 100, and I am ready.”’

This answer Lord Palmerston, from his sanguine disposition, construed as an acceptance; Sidney Herbert, with more penetration, as a refusal.

There is no doubt that the overtures to Lord Lansdowne here referred to were made, probably through Lord Melbourne. Lord Lansdowne and Lord Palmerston were the two members of the late Government who were most opposed to the scheme for reopening the question of the franchise by a new Reform Bill, which Lord John Russell pressed in season and out of season with so much ardour that it led subsequently to a momentary split in the Aberdeen Cabinet when Lord Palmerston resigned. But Lord Lansdowne was no supporter of Lord Palmerston’s foreign policy; he remained on the most confidential terms with Lord John Russell; and he intimated that he had no personal concern in whatever might take place, and felt great reluctance to ‘put to sea’ under any circumstances. The project had a real existence, but it led to no direct result. Equally visionary was the scheme to induce

Lord Palmerston to join Lord Derby's Government with the seals of the Home Office, although that too was mooted. But the indirect result was of some importance, because it placed Lord Palmerston in an intermediate position between the Whigs with whom he had quarrelled and the Tories whom he could not join, although there was at the time a strong impression that he would do so. Mr. Greville wrote in his journal on October 22 :—

‘I have just been for two days at Broadlands, where I had a good deal of talk with him, and I came away with the conviction that it would end in his joining the Government. He admitted it to be a possible contingency, but said he could not come in *alone*, and only in the event of a remodelling of the Cabinet and a sweep of a good many of the incapables now in it.’

Somewhat later, however, the situation was modified by an intimation from Lord John Russell to Lord Lansdowne that he would not object to serve under his old friend the Marquis. This letter was made known to Lord Palmerston, who replied with great satisfaction, saying, ‘for the first time he now saw ‘daylight in public affairs.’ Nothing, however, could be more perplexing and unsettled than the state of parties when Parliament met on November 11. Mr. Charles Villiers opened the attack on the Government by moving a strong resolution in favour of the maintenance and extension of the policy of free-trade, but he failed to carry it, an amendment having been suggested by Lord Palmerston, who thus came to the rescue of ministers. Everything turned upon the financial proposals of the Government, which were moved by Mr. Disraeli in a most elaborate speech on December 3, and rejected, after a long and impassioned debate, on the 16th by a majority of 19. The immediate consequence was the fall of the Derby Cabinet.

The crisis had at length arrived which had long been anticipated by Lord Aberdeen, and the solution of it rested with him as the chief organ of the Peelites, and with the Marquis of Lansdowne as the most experienced and respected leader of the Whigs. They were in a position to deal with the claims of either party, neither of them having either ambition or personal views of their own. On the contrary, their first interviews at Lansdowne House were spent in a mutual attempt of each of them to persuade the other to take the lead. The Queen had been advised to command the attendance of both these statesmen. Lord Lansdowne was physically unable at the moment to obey the summons, and the formation of the Government was placed in the hands of Lord Aberdeen, who

reluctantly accepted it. At this moment the slight differences of opinion which had arisen between the friends of Sir Robert Peel, and which had been combated by Lord Aberdeen, had disappeared. Sir James Graham at the Carlisle election advanced further than his friends had done towards an alliance with Lord John Russell; but he declined to attend the party dinner Lord John gave on the opening of Parliament. Sir James, notwithstanding his ample presence, his commanding style of oratory, and his genuine devotion to the best interests of the country, was not a bold or sanguine politician; he was apt to take a gloomy view of public affairs, and there were few public men to whom he gave the same entire confidence he felt in Lord Aberdeen. This had perhaps occasioned a momentary distrust of his motives, though he never was, as he expressed it, 'drummed out of the regiment.' Lord Aberdeen wrote to him on the eve of the meeting of Parliament:—

'I think you have perseveringly impressed Lord John with an erroneous notion of the objects of Gladstone and his friends. You are determined not to get rid of the apprehension yourself, and to make Lord John believe that, this great obstacle removed [this must refer to the question of Protection], Gladstone would find means to join the Government. Now it is my conviction that this is entirely without foundation. Gladstone's object is precisely the same as your own. He believes that no good can be done until the present Government shall be displaced.

'I was happy to be able to tell our friends [Gladstone, Herbert, and the Duke of Newcastle] the precise extent of your alliance with Lord John. There was evidently less of personal hostility to him, and I did all in my power to improve the occasion. He must feel that our eternal friendship cannot be struck up after the manner of a German play, but I feel satisfied that, with a little patience and good management, a cordial fusion will become practicable and easy.'

In point of fact Mr. Gladstone spoke with great energy against the financial measures of Lord Derby's Government, and contributed to the defeat sustained by the Government on the budget which led to their immediate resignation. There was therefore no essential difference of conduct between any of the friends of Sir Robert Peel and Lord Aberdeen. They were prepared for the coming event, although the question of Parliamentary Reform, to which Lord John Russell was pledged, and which Sir James Graham had accepted, might give rise to future difficulties; and there was a still wider divergency on ecclesiastical questions, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Sidney Herbert, and the Duke belonging to the High Church school, whilst Sir James Graham was a staunch supporter of the royal supremacy and the authority of the law in the

Established Church, in which he agreed with Lord Aberdeen. Nothing, however, appears to have been said on these subjects.

Far greater differences existed in the Liberal party. Some were for Lord John Russell, some against him; some supported Lord Palmerston, some condemned him. On the question of Reform Lord John would have to propose more than his Whig friends approved, or less than his Radical allies demanded. The utmost confusion and disunion prevailed. Lord Derby, on the contrary, was at the head of a compact party of 310 members of the House of Commons. If he could have prevailed on Lord Palmerston and Mr. Gladstone to join him (which might well have happened but for personal reasons), he might have succeeded in retaining power against a combination of disorganised and reluctant elements. The task which devolved upon Lord Aberdeen was, therefore, one of peculiar difficulty. He had not only to promote union and a good understanding amongst his immediate friends, but to obtain the assent and confidence of another party disposed to view himself with suspicion and rent asunder by strong animosities among its own members.

Before Lord Aberdeen proceeded to Osborne in obedience to her Majesty's commands, he called on Lord Lansdowne, who was too unwell to accompany him. The Marquis intimated that he was not desirous himself to undertake the heavy duties of Prime Minister. He admitted that he had been much pressed to do so by Lord Palmerston and others, that he was opposed to measures of Parliamentary Reform, that he was aware of the unwillingness of some of Peel's friends to serve under him, and that on the whole he considered Lord Aberdeen best fitted for the task at this juncture. He also promised, in general terms, his co-operation and assistance in arriving at a settlement with the Whigs. This promise Lord Lansdowne amply fulfilled; and it is not too much to say that without his tact, his firmness, and his just influence over his friends, the combination would have failed. For the difficulties lay in that quarter.

On December 18 Lord John Russell, having met Lord Aberdeen in the Park, volunteered the declaration that he was willing to lead the Commons and accept the seals of the Foreign Office under Lord Aberdeen. Lord Aberdeen jumped at his offer, commended its generosity, and closed with it on the spot. He went to Osborne, announced Lord John's consent, and, relying on it, accepted the Queen's commission to form a Government. On his return from Osborne he saw Lord John the same evening, who did not retract his proposal. But the

next morning early, Lord John went to Argyll House and declared that reflection and consultation with some of his friends had convinced him that the act of submission on his part was not consistent with his honour, and though he would support Lord Aberdeen's Government and advise his friends to join it, he could not be a member of it. Lord Aberdeen remonstrated, and told him that if he had known this before he saw the Queen, he would have acted differently. Lord John subsequently proposed to sit in the Cabinet and lead the House of Commons without holding any office; but this proposal was condemned as unprecedented and inadmissible. Lord Lansdowne informed Lord Aberdeen that he had spared no argument or suggestion he could think of to remove the hesitation, or more than hesitation, of Lord John, and he trusted with success. It so happened, as we know from another source, that Mr. Macaulay arrived whilst the interview between Lord Lansdowne and Lord John was going on at Lansdowne House. He had in fact been sent for. Lord Lansdowne told him the subject of their discussion, and the case was put before him with all its *pros* and *cons* for his opinion. He heard all they had to say, and then delivered his judgment in a very eloquent speech, strongly recommending Lord John to go on with Lord Aberdeen, and saying that, at such a crisis as this, the refusal of his aid (which was indispensable for the success of the attempt) would be little short of treason. Lord John was shaken, but did not give his final decision. Lord Clarendon afterwards repeated to him the same arguments. Lord John said, 'I suppose it will be as you wish;' but his vacillation and objections, renewed in various forms, placed the whole combination in suspense for several days, and were with difficulty surmounted. He insisted at last on taking the seals of the Foreign Office, though only to hold them for a few weeks, when he was succeeded in that department by Lord Clarendon, a far more competent and efficient Foreign Minister. His temporary acceptance of the seals of that department, which he announced to the foreign ambassadors and ministers at their first interview, was regarded by those eminent personages as a bad joke.

Strange to say, although the differences of opinion between Lord Palmerston and Lord Aberdeen were far greater than any existing between Lord Aberdeen and Lord John Russell, there was much less difficulty in inducing Lord Palmerston to take a practical view of the situation and to play his part in it. Lord Aberdeen called on him on December 21. Lord Palmerston received him very civilly, even cordially, talked of

old times, and reminded him that they had been acquainted for sixty years since they were at Harrow, and had lived together in the course of their political lives more than most men. Lord Aberdeen offered him the Admiralty, saying that he considered it in existing circumstances the most important office, and the one in which he could render the greatest service to the country, but if he preferred any other office, it should be at his disposal. Lord Palmerston, however, at first declined, alleging that although he had no hostile feeling to Lord Aberdeen, they had been so long and so often opposed to each other on foreign questions, that the public would misconstrue his motives in taking office under him. Here again the influence of Lord Lansdowne and Lord Clarendon was usefully exercised. But we have Lord Palmerston's own account of the transaction; he wrote to his brother-in-law, Mr. Sullivan:—

‘On Tuesday I positively declined joining the new Government, first to Lansdowne, who was nearly an hour talking to me, and afterwards to Aberdeen, who came and offered me *carte blanche* as to departments; but on Wednesday morning Clarendon came to tell me he had had the Foreign Office offered him, and that he was disposed to accept it. That removed much of the objection I had felt. When he left me, Lansdowne came again earnestly to press me to take office, and I at last consented to take the Home Office, the department I had mentioned as the one I should have preferred if I had been willing to join the new regiment. Reflection has satisfied me that I have acted rightly. The state of the country in all its interests, foreign and domestic, requires a Government as strong as there are elements for making it; and if my aid is thought by Lansdowne and others likely to be useful, I ought not to let personal feelings stand in the way. As regards myself individually, it must be borne in mind that when the Whigs and Peelites unite to form a Government, and to support it, I should, if I had persisted in standing aloof, have been left in a little agreeable political solitude. I am glad, therefore, that I have not adhered to my first determination; and I am sure that the course which, on second thoughts, I have pursued is the best for the public interest and for my own comfort.’ *

Lord Palmerston had before him the alternatives to accept office under Lord Aberdeen, or to join Lord Derby. Mr. Sidney Herbert had certain information on the 19th that, if not included in the arrangements, he would place himself at the head of the Opposition in the Commons. It turned upon the balance of a hair which course he should pursue; but his good judgment prevailed, and he took the right one. Even then, at the Tiverton election, Lord Palmerston spoke in complimentary

* Life of Lord Palmerston, by the Hon. Evelyn Ashley, vol. ii. p. 3.

terms of the Derby Government, as if he held that chance in reserve in the event of a failure of the Coalition Ministry.

The Government might now be said to be formed, although the minor appointments remained to be filled up, which was not accomplished without some difficulty, for the numerical strength of the Peelites in the House of Commons bore no just proportion to the number of offices allotted to them in the Cabinet, and this gave rise to dissatisfaction at Brookes's. Sir James Graham noted in his journal on December 23 :—

‘I have great faith in the strong cohesion of office; otherwise it might be difficult to bind together the materials of which the Cabinet will be composed. It will embrace, however, great administrative talent and debating power, and will present a more formidable front to the Protectionists than they deemed possible. The Government may be considered as formed; seven Peelites, five Whigs, one Radical (Sir William Molesworth) compose the Cabinet; John Russell and Palmerston will balance each other, and it may be possible with skill to pull between them. It is a powerful team, but it will require good driving. There are some odd tempers and queer ways among them; but on the whole they are gentlemen, and they have a perfect gentleman at their head, who is honest and direct, and who will not brook insincerity in others.’

Even later, the combination was placed in some danger by the wrangle for the minor offices. Lord Aberdeen did not admit the justice of the criticism made on the composition of the Cabinet, for he looked most to the fitness of the men for the offices they were to fill. The aspirants for office, many of whom were necessarily disappointed, fought as partisans for the representation and influence of their party. . Mr. Disraeli remarked that ‘the cake was too small for them all,’ or, as Mr. Fox had expressed it with respect to the Ministry of All the Talents, ‘We are three in a bed.’

It is not our intention to enter upon a history of the memorable Administration thus formed under Lord Aberdeen. No Government, of which we have experience, presented a greater array of administrative talent, of parliamentary eloquence, or of political experience. The causes which led to its premature and somewhat ignominious dissolution were not internal but external. During the first fifteen months of its existence, its course was as harmonious as that of any Cabinet of our times. The chief difficulty ahead lay in Lord John Russell's engagement to reopen the question of Parliamentary Reform, to which Lord Palmerston and Lord Lansdowne were opposed, and this led to the temporary withdrawal of the Home Secretary. When the draft of the Reform Bill was submitted to the

Cabinet, Lord Aberdeen gave it as his opinion that it might well have gone further in the liberal direction. But the event which really shook the Government to its foundations was one which no one foresaw at the moment of its formation—the occurrence of war with Russia. No man living was more averse to war than Lord Aberdeen, or more unwilling to believe in the occurrence of such a calamity. We remember to have heard him say some years later, in melancholy tones, ‘But I thought, too, that cloud would pass over us.’

The danger ahead began, however, to project its coming shadow, not many weeks after the formation of the Government, and Lord Aberdeen was not blind to it. Differences arose about the Holy Places, which Lord John Russell endeavoured to compose; but, as early as February 15, 1853, Lord Aberdeen wrote:—

‘Assurances of prompt and effective aid on the approach of danger, given by us to the Porte, would in all probability produce war. These barbarians hate us all, and would be delighted to take their chance of some advantage by embroiling us with the other Powers of Christendom. It may be necessary to give them a moral support and to endeavour to prolong their existence: but we ought to regard as the greatest misfortune any engagement which compelled us to take up arms for the Turks.’

These sentiments were so rooted in the mind of Lord Aberdeen, that he continued, to the last moment, to regard such a war as almost an impossibility, unless it should become necessary to defend Constantinople itself and the Bosphorus from a Russian invasion. Events, and the counteracting agency of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, proved too strong for ministers bent on the maintenance of peace. But, unhappily, the known repugnance of the British Cabinet to engage in such a war, and the language of what was called the ‘Manchester School,’ only encouraged the Emperor of Russia to persevere in his aggressive policy, though he doubtless was not aware of the catastrophe to which it was leading, which cost him his reputation and his life. It is curious to note, as we do from these papers, that the boldest and most energetic advocate in the Cabinet of the measures which led to war was Lord John Russell—more so than Lord Palmerston. It is true that more vigorous measures and a more explicit declaration of our policy at an earlier period might have warned Russia of the dangers which awaited her; but, on the other hand, the more the Porte felt it could rely on our succour, the more unreasonable it became, and the more eager for war.

Lord Aberdeen was disposed to place more confidence in

the honour and prudence of the Emperor Nicholas than they deserved ; and he was reluctant to take the early and vigorous measures which might possibly have averted the catastrophe, for the alliance of Turkey and of France under Napoleon III. offered no attraction to a British minister. He therefore held back as long as possible. With the advance of Russia and the attack on the Turkish squadron at Sinope, war became inevitable, and the nation entered upon it with enthusiasm. The despatch of the fleet, the landing in the Crimea, and the victory of the Alma were hailed as the precursors of the speedy fall of Sebastopol, and if that event had taken place at once, the Ministry would have been triumphant. But the sufferings and privations of the succeeding winter reversed the position, and the Government was held responsible for hope deferred, for imperfect military organisation, and for the miseries of a protracted siege and an inclement winter. That was natural, but we doubt whether any other Government would at the time, and with the materials at its disposal, have fared better. Our whole military system had become relaxed and obsolete in an unbroken peace of nearly forty years. The art of war had made immense progress with which we had not kept pace. The steam navigation of ships of war and the resources of modern gunnery were still in their infancy. Everything, save the valour of British troops and the gallantry of their inexperienced officers, had changed. Lord Aberdeen was too wise a man not to acknowledge that the only mode of terminating the war by an honourable peace was to conduct it with vigour ; and although the Duke of Newcastle, as Secretary of State for War under the new arrangement, had to bear the brunt of that unpopularity and misfortune which in so many ways attended him through life, we hold it no more than justice to say that no minister in his place could have laboured with more indefatigable zeal and judicious foresight in the administration of his department. He was the victim of circumstances, and the Prime Minister shared his fate ; but the actual cause of the dissolution of the Cabinet was the sudden resolution of Lord John Russell, when he refused to meet Mr. Roebuck's motion of censure and threw up the game. This abrupt determination of the Whig leader placed Lord Palmerston at the head of affairs, and terminated the official career of Lord Aberdeen.

Here we pause, for our object in pursuing with some minuteness the details of a single passage in the life of Lord Aberdeen is not so much historical as personal. We have sought to enable our readers to form a more correct judgment of a

singularly reserved, simple, and honest character, which was misunderstood even by his contemporaries, and we shall conclude these remarks by a sketch of that character by a master's hand. Lord Aberdeen died on December 14, 1860. Within a few months of that date Lord Herbert of Lea and Sir James Graham also passed away. The last affecting pages of the record from which we quote are devoted to the memory of these excellent men. The Duke of Newcastle followed them to the grave in 1864; and of the friends and colleagues of Sir Robert Peel, in a very few years, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Cardwell alone survived. Shortly after the death of Lord Aberdeen, Mr. Gladstone addressed to his son, now Sir Arthur Gordon, a letter in which he recorded his own impressions of the life and character of his departed friend. It is, we think, one of the purest tributes of respect and affection ever offered by one man of heart to another—remarkable alike for the breadth and justice of its views and for the elegance of its language. We shall therefore quote in conclusion as much of this paper as our limits will permit, and we shall add nothing to lessen the effect of these passages on the reader.

‘I may first refer to the earliest occasion on which I saw him; for it illustrates a point not unimportant in his history. On an evening in the month of January, 1835, during what is called the short Government of Sir Robert Peel, I was sent for by Sir Robert Peel, and received from him the offer, which I accepted, of the Under-Secretaryship for the Colonies. From him I went on to your father, who was then Secretary of State in that department, and who was thus to be, in official home-talk, my master. Without any apprehension of hurting you, I may confess that I went in fear and trembling. I knew Lord Aberdeen only by public rumour. Distinction of itself, naturally and properly, rather alarms the young. I had heard of his high character, but I had also heard of him as a man of cold manners, and close and even haughty reserve. It was dusk when I entered his room—the room on the first floor, with the bow-window looking to the Park—so that I saw his figure rather than his countenance. I do not recollect the matter of the conversation; but I well remember that before I had been three minutes with him, all my apprehensions had melted away like snow in the sun; and I came away from that interview conscious indeed—as who could fail to be conscious?—of his dignity, but of a dignity so tempered by a peculiar purity and gentleness, and so associated with impressions of his kindness, and even friendship, that I believe I thought more about the wonder of his being at that time so misunderstood by the outer world, than about the new duties and responsibilities of my new office. I was only, I think, for about ten weeks his under-secretary. But as some men hate those whom they have injured, so others love those whom they have obliged; and his friendship continued warm and unintermitting for the subsequent twenty-six years of his life.

‘Some of his many great qualities adorned him in common with several, or even with many, other contemporary statesmen, such as clearness of view, strength of the deliberative faculty, strong sense of duty, deep devotion to the Crown, and the most thorough and uncompromising loyalty to his friends and colleagues. In this loyalty of intention many, I think, are not only praiseworthy but perfect. But the loyalty of intention was in him so assisted by other and distinctive qualities, as to give it a peculiar efficacy; and anyone associated with Lord Aberdeen might always rest assured that he was safe in his hands. When our law did not allow prisoners the benefit of counsel, it was commonly said that the judge was counsel for the prisoner. Lord Aberdeen was always counsel for the absent. Doubtless he had pondered much upon the law, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.” It had entered profoundly into his being, and formed a large part of it. He was strong in his self-respect, but his respect for others—not for this man or that, but for other men as men—was much more conspicuous. Rarely indeed have I heard him utter a word concerning opponents, or concerning those who actually were or had been friends, that could have given pain. If, and when, it was done, it was done, so to speak, judicially, upon full and reluctant conviction, and with visible regret.

‘If I have said that he had much in common with other distinguished men, who were, like him, statesmen by profession, it has been by way of preface to what I have now to say, namely, that what has ever struck me most in his character, as a whole, was its distinctiveness. There were several mental virtues which he possessed in a degree very peculiar; there were, I think, one or two in which he stood almost alone. I am not in myself well qualified for handling a subject like this; and, also, my life has been too hurried to give me the most favourable opportunities. Still I must try to explain my meaning. I will name, then, the following characteristics, one and all of which were more prominent in him than in any public man I ever knew—mental calmness—the absence (if for want of better words I may describe by a negative) of all egotism; the love of exact justice, a thorough tolerance of spirit, and last, and most of all, an entire absence of suspicion. There was something very remarkable in the combination of these qualities, as well as in their separate possession. Most men, who might be happy enough to have one half of his love of justice, would be so tossed with storms of indignation at injustice, as to lose the balance of their judgment. But he had, or seemed to have, all the benefits, all the ennobling force, of strong emotion, with a complete exemption from its dangers. His mind seemed to move in an atmosphere of chartered tranquillity, which allowed him the view of every object, however blinding to others, in its true position and proportion.

‘It has always appeared to me that the love of justice is one of the rarest among all good qualities; I mean the love of it with full and commanding strength. I should almost dare to say there are five generous men for one just man. The beauty of justice is the beauty of simple form; the beauty of generosity is heightened with colour and every accessory. The passions will often ally themselves with

generosity, but they always tend to divert from justice. The man who strongly loves justice must love it for its own sake, and such a love makes of itself a character of a simple grandeur to which it is hard to find an equal.

‘There is, perhaps, no position in this country in which the love of justice, that I have ascribed in such extraordinary measure to your father, can be so severely tested, as in that very position of Foreign Minister with which his name is so closely associated. Nowhere is a man so constantly, and in such myriad forms, tempted to partiality; nowhere can he do more for justice; but nowhere is it more clear that all human force is inadequate for its end. A nation is rarely just to other nations. Perhaps it is never truly just, though sometimes (like individuals) what may be called more than just. There can be no difficulty in any country, least of all in this, in finding Foreign Ministers able and willing to assert the fair and reasonable claims of their countrymen with courage and with firmness. The difficulty is quite of another kind; it is to find the Foreign Minister, first, who will himself view those claims in the daylight both of reason and of prudence; secondly, and a far harder task, who will have the courage to hazard, and, if need be, to sacrifice himself in keeping the mind of his countrymen down to such claims as are strictly fair and reasonable. Lord Aberdeen was most happy in being Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the time and in the political company of two such men as the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel. He was also happy in the general prevalence of a spirit of great sobriety in the country, which was singularly free, under the Government of Sir Robert Peel, from the opposite but sometimes associated extremes of wantonness and fear. I am glad to think that his administration of his department earned a decided public approval. So just a man will, I think, rarely attain in that department to the same measure of popularity, while a less just man might easily obtain one far greater.’

Here Mr. Gladstone pauses to note with candour that a difference of opinion did exist between himself and Lord Aberdeen on the state of Italy and its relation to Austria in particular—‘the only question of practical importance on which during twenty-six years he was unable to accept Lord Aberdeen’s judgment.’

‘Though I feel that I cannot, by any effort, do justice to what I have termed his finely shaded character, I also feel that I might be drawn onwards to great length on the subject. I must resist the impulse, but I cannot stop without saying a word on the quality which I regard as beyond all others his own. I mean the absence from his nature of all tendency to suspicion. Those who have read his State papers, and have admired their penetrating force and comprehensive scope, will not misunderstand me when I say that he was in this respect a little child, not from defect of vision, but from thorough nobleness of nature.’

‘I do not think it was by effort and self-command that he rid himself of suspicion. In the simple and strong aim of the man to be good himself, it belonged to the very strength and simplicity of that aim that he should also think others good. I recollect, and I dare say you better recollect, one of his sayings—“I have a habit of believing people.” To some these words may not seem to import a peculiarity. But as descriptive of him they indicate what, of all the points of his character, seemed to me most peculiar. I have known one man as free from suspicion as was Lord Aberdeen, but he was not a politician. I am far from thinking statesmen or politicians less honourable than other men; quite the reverse. But the habit of their life renders them suspicious. The vicissitudes of politics, the changes of opinion, the changes of alliance, the sharp transitions from co-operation to antagonism, the inevitable contact with revolting displays of self-seeking and self-love; more than all these, perhaps, the constant habit of forecasting the future, and shaping all its contingencies beforehand, which is eminently the merit and intellectual virtue of the statesman: all these tend to make him, and commonly do make him, suspicious even of his best friend. This suspicion may be found to exist in conjunction with regard, with esteem, nay, with affection. For it must be recollected that it is not usually a suspicion of moral delinquency, but (at least as it dwells in the better and higher natures) of intellectual error only, in some of its numerous forms, or at most, of speaking with a reserve that may be more or less, or even wholly, unconscious. None of these explanations are needed for Lord Aberdeen. He always took words in their direct and simple meaning, and assumed them to be the index of the mind, and its full index too; so that he did not speculate to learn what undiscovered residue might still remain in its dark places. This entire immunity from suspicion, which makes our minds in general like a haunted place, and the sense of the immunity that he conveyed to his friends in all his dealings with them, combined with the deep serenity of his mind, which ever seemed to beguile and allay, by some kindly process of nature, excitement in others, gave an indescribable charm to all intercourse with him in critical and difficult circumstances. Hence, perhaps, in great part, and not merely from his intellectual gifts, was derived the remarkable power he seemed to me to exercise, in winning confidences without seeking to win them; and on the whole I believe that this quality, could we hold it as it was held in him, would save us from ten erroneous judgments for one into which it might lead. For the grand characteristic of suspicion after all—as of superstition—is to see things that are not.

‘I turn now to another point. Lord Aberdeen was not demonstrative. I do not suppose he could have been an actor. He was unstudied in speech, and it is of interest to enquire what it was that gave such extraordinary force and impressiveness to his language. He did not deal in antithesis. His sayings were not sharpened with gall. In short, one might go on disclaiming for him all the accessories to which most men who are impressive owe their impressiveness. Yet I never knew anyone who was so impressive, in brief utterances conveying the sum of the matter. One of these in particular he mentioned to me, as

he may have done to others, but it cannot be too much remembered, from its connexion with one of the most momentous declarations that have, in modern times, proceeded from the lips of an individual man. When the Duke of Wellington, in November 1830, had pronounced his rather idolatrous eulogy on the Parliamentary Constitution of England, and had thus become, against his will, a main, or perhaps the main, author of the Reform Bill, on his sitting down he turned to Lord Aberdeen, who was by him, and used the words—"I have not said too much, have I?" Lord Aberdeen replied, "You'll hear of it." He did hear of it! England and Europe heard of it, and history has caught, and will hold, the echo.

'History has also caught, and will hold firmly and well, the honoured name of your father. There was no varnish upon his reputation, more than upon his character. He will be remembered in connexion with great passages of European policy, not only as a man of singularly searching, large, and calm intelligence, but yet more as the just man, the man that used only true weights and measures, and ever held even the balance of his ordered mind. It is no reproach to other statesmen, of this or of other periods, to say that scarcely any of them have had a celebrity so entirely unaided by a transitory glare. But if this be so, it implies that while they, for the most part, must relatively lose, he must relatively and greatly gain. If they have had stage-lights, and he has had none, it is the hour when those lights are extinguished that will, for the first time, do that justice as between them, which he was too noble, too far aloft in the tone of his mind, to desire to anticipate. All the qualities and parts in which he was great were those that are the very foundation-stones of our being; as foundation-stones they are deep, and as being deep they are withdrawn from view; but time is their witness and their friend, and in the final distribution of posthumous fame, Lord Aberdeen has nothing to forfeit, he has only to receive.'

INDEX.

- Aberdeen, Lord*, review of his 'Correspondence,' 547—his view of Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état*, 551—his opposition to the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, 553—resignation of Lord John Russell, 554—first attempt at a Whig-Peelite alliance, its terms, 554—King Leopold's letter on the political situation, 555—circumstances of Lord Palmerston's dismissal, 557—the Derby Administration, 558—Lord John Russell's overture to Lord Aberdeen, 559—views of Lord Aberdeen, 559—disuse of the term 'Whig,' 562—attitude of Mr. Gladstone respecting the proposed combination, 563—Lord Palmerston's project of a Lansdowne Cabinet, 564—Lord Aberdeen charged with the formation of a Government, 565—vacillation of Lord John Russell, 567—Lord Palmerston's acceptance of office under Lord Aberdeen, 568—dissolution of the Coalition Government, 570—Mr. Gladstone's character of Lord Aberdeen, 573.
- Allen, Cardinal*, 'Letters and Memorials' of, reviewed, 354—penal laws of Elizabeth against the Catholics, 356—share of Pius V. in the rebellion of 1569, 361—the bull of deposition, 363—zeal of Gregory XIII., 366—the Jesuit mission, 366—Parsons's plot for the invasion of England, 370—plan of Guise and Mayenne for the assassination of Elizabeth, 373—complicity of the Pope and the Spanish King, 374—Father Knox's defence, 376—Philip II. urged by Allen to invade England, 378—memorandum of Olivares on the Pope's views of the Spanish project, 379—Allen's scheme of official appointments—bull of Sixtus and Allen's 'Admonition,' 383—reasonable character of the seminaries, 386—statements of Cardinal d'Ossat and De Thou, 387.
- Angling*, bibliography of, 152—examples of antiquarian rarities, 159—Richard Franck's book, 161—Diaper and Jones's translation of Oppian's 'Halieutics,' 163—Father Vanière's Latin verses on fish-preserves, 163—editions of Walton, their number, 165—spiritualisation of the fisherman's art in the seventeenth century: Dr. Gardiner's book, 166—Dr. Rawlinson's and Jerom Phillips's sermons, 167—Boyle's 'Reflections,' 168—literature of fishponds, 168.

C

- Charles VII.* of France, M. de Beaucourt's history of, reviewed, 170—general view of the reign, 172—character of the king, 174—war of the Burgundian and Armagnac factions, 178—murder of John the

Fearless, 179—alliance between Philip of Burgundy and Henry V., 180—influence of the warfare of the period on the course of the struggle, 183—weakness of the coalition, 185—devotion of France to Charles, 187—the Maid of Orleans, 188—her first audience with the king, 189—eye-witness's sketch of her in the field, 190—Congress of Arras, 190—scene at the signature of the treaty, 193—special faults of Charles's character, 194—his misgovernment, 195—administration of La Tremoille, 196—noble demeanour of the States-General, 196—M. de Beaucoûrt's reflections on the monarchical principle, 197.

Chopin contrasted with Schubert, 487—traits of his character, 489—his relations with George Sand, 492—his treatment of the piano-forte, 494—qualities of his music, 497.

Colquhoun, A. R. See *Tonquin*.

Copernicus, Dr. Prowe's life of, 295—his disputed nationality, 299—parentage and birth, 301—the town of Thorn, 302—studies at the University of Cracow, 304—obtains the canonry of Frauenburg, 306—studies canon law at Bologna, 307—and medicine at Padua, 308—his life in the Castle of Heilsberg as his uncle's medical attendant, 310—translates Theophylactus Simocatta, 313—miserable fate of his brother Andrew, 315—the canonry of Frauenburg, 316—astronomical investigations there, 317—the 'triquetrum,' 318—war of the Frankish troopers, 319—scheme for the reform of the Prussian coinage, 321—administrative abilities, 322—medical knowledge, 323—intimacy with Rheticus, 326—completion of the work on the revolutions of the heavenly bodies, 327—death-bed scene, 328—dishonest preface of Oslander, 329—the Copernican system, 330.

D

Drama, passion for the, in ancient Greece, 57—historical development of, in France and Germany, 58—'Dialogues' of Hroswitha, 59—displacement of Latin by the vernacular, 60—the 'Miracles de Notre Dame,' 61—plot of 'Robert le Diable,' 62—the 'Mystères Cycliques,' 62—stage demons, 63—Italy, 64—Spain, 65—Poland, 66—Slavonia, 67—English 'disguisings,' 68—'interludes' and 'masques,' 69—Latin school plays, 70—stage-players in the time of Elizabeth, 71—restrictions on account of the plague, 72—extra-municipal houses, 73—strolling players, 74—origin of the Shakespearian clown, 76—rivalry of Killigrew and Davenant, 77—influence of Shakespeare on dramatic tastes, 79—English plays of the present, 81—moral aspect of stage life, 83—Rachel and the Czar, 89.

E

English law, M. Glasson's history of, 118—Germanic origin of our common law: conservative influence of the ocean, 121—work of Alfred the Great, 123—origin of trial by jury, 124—the ordeal, 125—the wer-geld, 125—effect of the Norman Conquest, 127—the judicial combat, 130—feudal tenures, 132—knight's service, 133—aids, 133—reliefs, wardship and marriage, 134—villénage, 135—

itinerant justices, their supposed connexion with the Karolingian *missi dominici*, 137—Magna Carta, 139—its position with respect to legislation, 140—laws relating to land settlement, 141—alienation by tenants 'in fee simple, 144—first appointment of administrators of personal estate, 145—trade enactments, 146—connexion between statutes and social institutions, 147—equitable jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery, 148—origin of feoffment to uses, 149.

F

Fayrer, Sir J., his 'Thanatophidia of India' reviewed, 199.

Fitzgerald, Percy, his 'History of the English Stage' reviewed, 76.

G

Gettysburg. See *Vicksburg*.

Glasson, Ernest, his 'History of English Law' reviewed, 118.

H

'*Herefordshire Pomona*' reviewed, 447—supposed allusions to apples in Hebrew and Greek, 449—Cato and Palladius on the cultivation of apples and pears, 452—Roman mode of preserving and making drinks from these fruits, 453—orchard-growing in England by the monks, 455—pearmaines and costards, 456—earliest English cider, 457—poem of John Philips, 459—Geraide's notice of Herefordshire orchards, 460—Rev. Martin Johnson on the longevity of cider-drinkers, 460—derivation of the word 'apple,' 461 note—influence of soil on apples, 462—dying-out theory of Thomas Knight, 463—experiments in cross-fertilisation, 465—how to manage an orchard, 466—tree enemies and diseases, 470—orchard-farming, 472—horticulture and fruit-growing as school subjects, 471.

Hopley, Catherine. See *Snakes*.

Houghton, Rev. W., his 'History of British Freshwater Fishes' reviewed, 165.

I

Italy, commission of enquiry into the condition of the agricultural classes of, 90—Signor Morpurgo's report on Venetia, 93—the province of Belluno, 94—mountain districts characterised by moral superiority and wretched habitations, 94—temporary migrations, 96—decay of the family tie, 97—crime, 99—relations between the tillers and owners of the soil, 100—the *mezzadria* system, 101—exceptional prosperity in the islands of the lagoon, 103—past and present condition of the peasantry compared, 104—deplorable picture of agricultural poverty and failure, 108—discontent of the rural population, 112—over-taxation for military purposes, 114—unjust local incidence of the property tax, 115.

J

Jamieson's 'Dictionary of the Scottish Language' reviewed, 420.

John, Don, of Austria, date of birth and early years of, 5—testamentary dispositions of Charles V. concerning him, 7—recognition by his

brother, Philip II., 8—early martial propensities, 10—appointed Admiral of the Fleet, 11—letter to Philip requesting a command against the Moors of Granada, 13—scene of the campaign, 14—Selim II., 18—Pius V., 20—the command of the Turkish expedition, 22—the Holy League, 22—the Venetian contingent, 25—departure of the armada from Messina, 26—meeting of the hostile fleets, 28—the battle of Lepanto, 30—bravery of Cervantes, 34—honours paid to the victor, 36—death of the Pope, 37—treachery of Venice and dissolution of the League, 38—operations of Don John against Tunis, 39—appointed viceroy of the Netherlands, 41—his statement of policy, 41—dream of invading England, 42—William the Silent, 46—underplots and intrigues, 49—character of Don John's administration, 50—battle of Gemblours, 51—report of Queen Elizabeth's agent on Don John's position, 51—battle of Rijnemants, 52—abortive peace negotiations, 53—prostrate with fever in camp, 53—neglected by Philip, 54—his death, 56

L

Law and custom, early, review of works treating of, 333—sacred law of the Hindus, 334—posthumous punishments and penal transigrations, 335—ancestor-worship, its connexion with the law of inheritance, 337—collateral succession in India, 340—Western systems of succession to the throne, 341—the Salic law, 343—injustice of Edward III.'s pretensions, 346—Sir H. Maine's explanation of the variance between French and English usages, 348—judicial character of the early kings, 350—royal progresses: King John, 351—localisation of the Common Pleas at Westminster, 352.

Liszt as a pianist, Henry Chorley's impressions of, 502—as a composer, 504—his personal character, 507—his connexion with the Countess d'Agoult, 508.

Lyall, Sir A., his 'Asiatic Studies' reviewed, 333.

M

Maine, Sir H. S., his 'Early Law and Custom' reviewed, 333.

Maxwell, Sir W. S., his 'Don John of Austria' reviewed, 1.

P

Paris, Comte de, his history of the Civil War in America reviewed, 510.

Peerage, review of Burke's and Foster's dictionaries of the, 225—diminished regard for birth in modern days, 225—Rev. Mr. Robertson on hereditary rank as a counteractive of the idolatry of wealth, 226—satirical pedigrees, 227—humble life of high descent, 228—glorification of their lowly origin by self-made men, 229—fabrication of pedigrees, 230—distinction between nobility and peerage, 231—origin of our modern nobility, 232—Milles's 'Catalogue of Honor,' 233—Brooke's 'Catalogue,' 233—Yorke's 'Union of Honour,' 234—Dugdale's 'Baronage,' 234—Collins's 'Peerage,' 235—use made of it by Carlyle, 236—Crawford's and Douglas's Scotch Peerages, 237—Wood's edition of Crawford, 238—Crossley's Irish Peerage, 239—

Guthrie's Peerage, 239—Edmondson's 'Heraldry,' 240—Playfair's 'British Family Antiquity,' 241—Debrett's 'Peerage,' 241—Lodge's 'Peerage,' 242—question of precedence in connexion with Scotch baronets, 244—Sir B. Burke's extraordinary pedigrees, 245—Mr. Foster's 'Peerage and Baronetage,' 247—jurisdiction in matters relating to the peerage of Scotland, 249—curious story of a Scottish baronetcy, 254.
Prowse, Dr. L., his 'Life of Copernicus' reviewed, 295.

R

Russia, advance of, in Asia by a proposed railway to Herat, 390—physical geography of the Transcasian region, 394—M. Lessar's survey, 395—the Robat Pass, 397—route from Askabad to Sarakhs, 399—petroleum industry at Baku, 405—the Transcaucasian railway, 410—commercial inutility of the proposed line, 411—availability for military transport, 414—opinion of Sir Henry Rawlinson, 417—effect on our defensive military position in India, 417.

S

Schubert, an example of genius without painstaking, 477—his musical powers in early life, 478—his want of ideas about his art, 479—his personal character, 480—character of his music, 482.
Scottish language, its place among the dialects of English, 421—its Teutonic basis, 423—influence of France, 424—the Celtic element, 426—from what portion of the Teutonic race derived, 427—specimens of the popular dialect, 429—terms for parts of the body, 430—Scotch more Teutonic than modern English, 433—power of compounding words, 434—erroneous idea of growth and decay of language, 435—the so-called principle of 'laziness,' 436—peculiar Scotch compounds suggestive of a creative faculty, 437—grammatical peculiarities, 438—use of 'devil' in negations, 439—'Heckelbirne,' or 'Heckiebirne,' 440—changes of vocables, 441—numerous expressions for 'topsy-turvy,' 442—the Aberdeenshire dialect, 445.
Seeborn, Frederic, his 'English Village Community,' noticed, 333
Snakes, natural appearance and systematic characters of, 199—rudimentary limbs of the Pythonidæ, 201—geographical distribution, 202—different kinds, 204—apparatus of progression, 204—mechanism of deglutition, 205—exaggerated stories of swallowing powers, 206—mode of propagation, 207—snakes, 207—subdivisions of the order, 208—rattlesnake's tail, 210—Miss Hopley's observation of independent constricting powers, 213—do snakes swallow their young? 214—the 'great sea serpent,' 216—snake-taming, 218—venomous snakes of India, 218—infants poisoned by milk of bitten women, 219—hamadryad, or snake-eating snake, 220—krait, tic-polonga, and *Echis carinata*, 221—inefficacy of alleged antidotes, 222—death-rate from snakebite, 223—Dr. Stradling's plan of extermination, 224.

T

Tonquin, discovery by M. Dupuis of the Songcoi route into South-West China through, 262—his expedition up the river, 263—M. Garnier's armed mission, 266—capture of the Anamese forts, 269—M. Philastre's letter of remonstrance, 270—death of Garnier, 271—treaty of Saigon, 272—treachery of the French towards the Tonquinese rebels, 273—disappointment of commercial expectations, 274—renewal of operations under Captain Rivière, 275—hopes of the French, 276—the experience of Saigon, 277—statements of Mr. Coluhoun compared with those of M. Rocher, 279—no benefit possible for French commerce, 281—suzerainty of China over Anam, 281—King Tuduc's appeal to Pekin, 283—the duty of China, 285—shortcomings and dangers of French policy, 287.

V

Vicksburg and Gettysburg, review of works by the Comte de Paris and other authors relating the Federal successes at, 510—position of Vicksburg, 513—repulse of Sherman's attack, 514—unsuccessful attempt to reach the Yazoo, 516—loss of the 'Indianola' and 'Queen of the West,' 520—Farragut's expedition from the south, 520—junction of Porter's squadron, 523—Grant's victory at Port Gibson, 524—reprehensible conduct of Pemberton, 525—retreat of Johnston from Jackson, 526—defeat of Pemberton at Champion's Hill, 527—fall of Vicksburg, 529—passage of the Rapahannock by the Federals, 531—battle of Chancellorsville, 533—death of Stonewall Jackson, 535—march of Lee into Pennsylvania, 537—the gathering at Gettysburg, 539—the Federal position at Cemetery Hill, 541—the fight, 543—annihilation of Pickett's division, 545—influence of this battle on the war, 546.

END OF VOL. CLVIII.

